

Austin, Tex., favoring appropriation for National Youth Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1509. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Reclamation Board of the State of California, Sacramento, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to appointing J. LEROY JOHNSON to the House Committee on Flood Control; to the Committee on Flood Control.

1510. Also, petition of the Ironwood Chamber of Commerce, Ironwood, Mich., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the National Youth Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1511. Also petition of sundry citizens of the State of Nebraska, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1512. Also, petition of the Pan American Union, of Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Pan American Day; to the Committee on Rules.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JUNE 10, 1943

(Legislative day of Monday, May 24, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

Dr. Horace E. Cromer, district superintendent of the Methodist Church, offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, Spiritual Father to all men, Arbiter of the destiny of the nations of the whole earth, it is just and needful that we renew with each new dawn our allegiance to Thee and to Thy will. This we pause to do. We seek Thy guidance, Thy way, and Thy purposes for this day. Make us to know that which is right in Thy sight.

Let the blessing of our Father God rest on each of us here assembled, all those whom we represent, the men of our far-flung national forces, the leaders of the nations, and all men. We ask in Jesus' name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, June 9, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Caraway	Hatch
Andrews	Chandler	Hawkes
Austin	Chavez	Hayden
Bailey	Clark, Mo.	Hill
Ball	Connally	Holman
Bankhead	Danaher	Johnson, Colo.
Barbour	Davis	La Follette
Bilbo	Eastland	Langer
Bone	Ellender	Lodge
Brewster	Ferguson	Lucas
Bridges	George	McCarran
Buck	Gerry	McClellan
Burton	Gillette	McFarland
Bushfield	Green	McKellar
Byrd	Guffey	McNary
Capper	Gurney	Maloney

Maybank	Revercomb	Vandenberg
Mead	Reynolds	Van Nuys
Millikin	Russell	Wallgren
Moore	Scruggam	Walsh
Murdoch	Shipstead	Wheeler
Murray	Smith	Wherry
Nye	Stewart	White
O'Daniel	Taft	Wiley
O'Mahoney	Thomas, Okla.	Willis
Overton	Thomas, Utah	Wilson
Pepper	Tobey	
Radcliffe	Tunnell	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business for the Committee on Military Affairs.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] are members of the congressional committee attending the funeral of the late Representative Guyer, and are therefore necessarily absent from the city.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES FOR THE INTERIOR DEPARTMENT (S. Doc. No. 64)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Department of the Interior, fiscal year 1944, in the amount of \$17,285,000, in the form of amendments to the Budget for that fiscal year (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

COMPENSATION FOR USEFUL SUGGESTIONS OR INVENTIONS BY PERSONNEL OF THE INTERIOR DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide equitable compensation for useful suggestions or inventions by personnel of the Department of the Interior (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

MORE ADEQUATE AND UNIFORM ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS IN VETERANS' LAWS PERTAINING TO COMPENSATION, AND SO FORTH

A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide more adequate and uniform administrative provisions in veterans' laws pertaining to compensation, pension, and retirement pay payable by the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

MARCH 1943 REPORT OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report of the Corporation for the month of March 1943, relating to loan and other authorizations (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

TRANSFERS AND REDUCTIONS OF PERSONNEL IN THE CLASSIFIED CIVIL SERVICE

A letter from the President of the United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting, pursuant to Senate Resolution 84 (78th Congress), a summary table of reports for the month of April 1943 (including all replies received in the Commission through May 29, 1943) submitted by the various executive departments and agencies; also a separate list of those agencies from which no reports, or from which only partial or incomplete reports were received (with accompanying papers); ordered to lie on the table.

PETITIONS

Petitions, etc., were presented, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BILBO:

A petition of sundry citizens of Jackson and vicinity, in the State of Mississippi, praying for the enactment of the so-called Bryson bill (H. R. 2082) to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A petition of sundry citizens of Jackson and vicinity, in the State of Mississippi, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition of sundry citizens, members of St. Peter's Evangelical and Reformed Church, of Inman, Kans., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. TUNNELL, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 159. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the United States Parcel Post Building Company, of Cleveland, Ohio; with amendments (Rept. No. 301), and

S. 346. A bill for the relief of Harriet B. Rickords; without amendment (Rept. No. 302).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 254. A bill for the relief of Edward Gilman; with an amendment (Rept. No. 303).

By Mr. WILSON, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 462. A bill for the relief of Primo Giordanengo and Angie Giordanengo; with an amendment (Rept. No. 304); and

S. 1090. A bill for the relief of John Henry Miller, Junior; without amendment (Rept. No. 307).

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1038. A bill for the relief of Verna Mae Rossell and Winifred Rossell; with amendments (Rept. No. 305).

By Mr. O'DANIEL, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 575. A bill for the relief of Peter Cuccio and Violet Cuccio; without amendment (Rept. No. 306).

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Indian Affairs:

H. R. 1947. A bill to extend the time within which a suit or suits may be brought under the act of June 28, 1938 (52 Stat. 1209); without amendment (Rept. No. 308).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Sundry officers for promotion for temporary service, sundry naval aviators of the Marine Corps Reserve for appointment in the Regular Marine Corps in accordance with the provisions of law, and sundry citizens and a meritorious noncommissioned officer to be second lieutenants, all in the Marine Corps.

By Mr. MCKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 1217. A bill to equalize the pay and allowances of retired naval officers employed on active duty in the rank of rear admiral with those of rear admirals on the active list, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CHAVEZ (for himself, Mr. WHEELER, Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. MOORE, Mr. BUSHFIELD, Mr. LANGER, and Mr. GURNEY):

S. 1218. A bill to repeal the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. L. 984), and the act of June 15, 1935, supplementary thereto (49 Stat. L. 378), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CONNALLY:

S. 1219. A bill to give effect to the Provisional Fur Seal Agreement of 1942 between the United States of America and Canada; to protect the fur seals of the Pribilof Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS—AMENDMENT

Mr. BYRD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 2481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, as follows:

On page 95, line 11, after the figures "\$421,039", to insert the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That no part of the appropriation authorized under this item shall be used except for the complete liquidation of the resettlement projects which shall be accomplished by December 31, 1943.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY BEFORE SOLID FUEL INSTITUTE OF MILWAUKEE, WIS.

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Great Need of Mankind—Cooperation," delivered by him before the Solid Fuel Institute of Milwaukee on June 7, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY ASSISTANT SECRETARY BERLE TO GRADUATING CLASS OF UTAH STATE AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Assistant Secretary of

State Hon. Adolf A. Berle, Jr., to the graduating class of Utah State Agricultural College, Logan, Utah, May 29, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

STRATEGY OF THE UNITED NATIONS—ARTICLE BY CLIFFORD B. WARD

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article on the strategy of the United Nations written by Clifford B. Ward and published in the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel, which appears in the Appendix.]

EDITORIAL TRIBUTE TO JOSEPHUS DANIELS FROM TACOMA (WASH.) NEWS-TRIBUNE

[Mr. BONE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Newspaper Sage" from the Tacoma News-Tribune of June 4, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE BATTLE OF WASHINGTON—ARTICLE BY JAY FRANKLIN

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Battle of Washington," by Jay Franklin, printed in the June 1943 issue of the Railroad Trainman, which appears in the Appendix.]

RAILROAD FREIGHT RATES—ADDRESS BY GEORGE M. CROWSON

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address on railroad freight rates delivered by George M. Crowson, assistant to the president, Illinois Central System, before the Traffic Club of New Orleans, on May 10, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

BITUMINOUS-COAL PRODUCTION IN WEST VIRGINIA

[Mr. REVERCOMB asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "West Virginia May Set Record in Coal Output," from the Washington Evening Star of June 10, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

INCREASED ALLOTMENTS TO DEPENDENTS OF ENLISTED MEN—ADDRESS BY SENATOR LODGE

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by him on June 6, 1943, on the subject of increased allotments to dependents of enlisted men in the armed services, which appears in the Appendix.]

RESTRICTIONS ON THE USE OF GASOLINE

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I wish to voice the protest of the people of Indiana and of adjoining States against the enforcement of additional restrictions in that area on the use of gasoline for essential purposes. I am prompted to do this by the great volume of protests which have come to me, and I desire to have inserted in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the names of some of those who have sent the protests, to indicate the character of the men and the businesses they represent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the names were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Frederick M. Sutter, Columbus, Ind.
Powell Chevrolet, Inc., Columbus, Ind.
McKibben & Merrill, Terre Haute, Ind.
Dr. D. G. Walesby, Indianapolis, Ind.
W. A. Oeffler, president, Jasonville Industrial Bureau, Jasonville, Ind.

Bruce C. Kixmiller, Inc., Vincennes, Ind.
Harry R. Baldwin, Anderson, Ind.
Clapp Motor Sales, Jeffersonville, Ind.
Hermann C. Wolff, Indianapolis, Ind.
Webster Cafe, Monticello, Ind.

Lowell L. Martin and Will Thomas, La Fayette, Ind.

William J. Duncan, Samuel C. Ennis, Harry B. Sanger, Harry Folk, Thor Kolle, William N. Lave, Harold G. Muenich, and Gertrude Labahn, Hammond, Ind.

Harold E. Laufer, president, St. Joseph Valley Bank, Elkhart, Ind.

James H. Bryant, Vincennes, Ind.

Paul Steem, Nathan Reiff, William Welch, Ivan F. Goodrich, Otis B. Fields, Ted L. Forney, Simon Koontz, Jr., Theodore A. Reitz, Clarence F. Leist, and Clifford P. Martin, Elkhart, Ind.

Wilcox Motor Sales, Jeffersonville, Ind.

Vorgang Motor Sales Co., Jeffersonville, Ind.
Jeffersonville Board of Trade, Jeffersonville, Ind.

Evansville Automobile Dealers Association, J. E. O'Daniel, president, Evansville, Ind.

Osborn Bros. Garage, Jeffersonville, Ind.

William May, S. N. A. & Gravel Co., Fort Wayne, Ind.

Indiana Independent Petroleum Association, Indianapolis, Ind.

Bill Nichol, president, South Bend and Mishawaka Auto Trade Association, South Bend, Ind.

Automobile Club Service Bureau, Joseph L. Asay, American Assurance Corporation, Clyde Baugh & Co., P. W. Burns, Citizens Trust & Savings Bank, Commercial Agency, Inc., John W. Cook, Arthur Deitsch, E. J. Eisterhold, Fred Englehart, Franklin Bank & Trust Co., Greene & Green, Harris & Wade, Heyns Insurance Agency, Eli G. Huber, J. C. Hutchinson, Interstate Finance Corporation, Kattman Insurance Agency, Kinkle Realty & Insurance Co., Sylvester Krock, Levi Bros., Percy C. Logsdon, Fritz Long, Lukens & Sons, McCoy Realty & Insurance Co., McReynolds & Dreier, Harry R. Miles Insurance Agency, Arthur C. Miller, George O. Miller, W. J. Muenstermann, North Side Insurance Agency, Ole H. Olson, Richard J. Peters, Richardt Agency, Inc., Bernard Schenk, Bayard V. Somes, Southern Commercial Agency, George H. Stockwell Agency, Strassweg Insurance Agency, Torian Insurance Agency, Walker Insurance Agency, A. M. Weil & Bros. Co., Werner Realty & Insurance Co., D. Ed Williams, William R. Woods, West Side Insurance Agency, West Side Investment Co., Evansville, Ind.

Lorraine Boerger, Kenneth Beard, Walter Binder, Richard Blitz, Herman Bohnke, Henry Branning, Florence Brower, John Wolfrum, Henry Curdes, Vilas Feasel, George Fishing, Leo Weber, Irma Hartman, John Hartwig, Raymond Hawver, Paul Hess, Al Hoffman, David Hostetter, Hamilton Hunter, Walter Keeberg, Frank Lahmeyer, Effie Lucas, Walter Lupke, Clem Mettler, Miller & Lawry, Vern Mitchell, William Moellering, Fred Niemeyer, Harry Geoglein, Eugene Pequignot, Alfred Randall, Walter Rosenwinkel, Schaaf & Auer, William Scheiman, Henry Schoppman, Earl Seibold, Frieda Colditz, Paul Spear, Ralph Stogdill, Ray Kuhn, Willard Thomas, Joseph Till, William VonDreau, Fred Wiedemann, Fort Wayne, Ind.

Southeastern Indiana Division of Cincinnati Automobile Club, Cincinnati, Ohio.

S. T. Berner, W. H. Bruner, Clifford Fletcher, Alexis Coquillard, J. W. Montgomery, Carl W. Ginz, Eugene Happ, Stanley J. Muszynski, Joseph Neff, Clarence Haas, C. E. Perins, Russel E. Smith, F. L. Nelson, Arthur P. Perley, W. S. Phillips, Paul Shanahan, C. Mont Smith, J. Harold Keracof, Walter Stoner, George E. Keller, Dean Swadner, Fred J. Huns, Marvin Mogle, A. J. Schindler, Regis Richard, Roy E. Rohleder, South Bend, Ind.
A. L. Anchors, Guy S. Ayers, Leslie Bain, David Furse, A. N. Blank, Emma Claus, M. A.

Braman, J. S. Brown, Forest S. Briggs, Thomas J. Welch, Theodore H. Dauer, Caroline Darjos, Edward Flannery, William F. Funke, Mary Kent, T. M. Kitchen, Annabelle H. Huffin, Kenneth McLennan, Harry Hall, Paul Christy, Edward Jakoby, Fred Jannasch, Tyrie Robbins, Wm. Glover, Milo Vale, Gus Kravis, Al Krueger, Alex. Lyris, Julius Mathhies, Ralph Patchter, J. A. Oberdorfer, Walter Pickart, Ralph Rhoades, George Rogge, Wm. Schmidt, John Schneider, E. C. Simpson, F. M. Sopcak, Margaret Graham, J. A. Vitkus, Matthew Vlasic, C. A. Wachowiak, Margaret Walsh, Warren Wise, Fred Wildermuth, Gary, Ind.

Peter Belzeski, John J. Bochnowski, Albert Lesniak, Leo Bonaventura, Jos. W. Dunsing, D. W. Dupes, Max M. Friedman, Margaret R. Hannusin, Alan E. Lewis, John Manta, Lloyd Hurst, Mike Marcovich, D. L. Mitchell, George Mosny, John Packer, R. H. Smith, John J. Block, Jos. Wleklinski, East Chicago, Ind.

The Brazil Trust Co., Burns Agency, Lester Cagle Insurance Agency, Ray L. Coughanowr, May Garrison, Oscar Houk, Indiana Agency, Kidd Insurance Agencies, McQueen & Morgan, J. O. Mullinix Insurance Agency, A. B. Nees & Sons, C. Herman Pell & Son, John Randolph, W. E. Schultz, Rousch & Long, Don Staley, Worth Stigler, Bruan Meyer, Brazil, Ind.

The Geo. H. Knollenberg Co., F. H. Haner, president, Richmond, Ind.

Davis Auto Co., Fort Wayne, Ind.

La Fayette Board of Fire & Casualty Underwriters, N. O. Neiburger, W. G. Thomas, J. C. Goris, F. A. Tedford, Ralph Mayerstein, E. E. Hollenbeck, George W. Burnell, Floy Brunton, Ray Adams, Richard Underwood, C. H. Hockema, Walter Graham, Charles Nicher, Willia Teal, Charles Stallard, Clifford Bowerman, James Erickson, George Balf, William Ball, Millard Overton, Harold Brelsford, B. K. Dicks, George Price, James Price, Ernest Collins, La Fayette, Ind.

J. Rolland Stinson, Leslie N. Carter, Victor A. White, Geraldine Maynard, John F. Wilhelm, Norman Tapper, Paul Segrist, Charles J. Kaufman, Ruth Horan, Henry C. Reissig, Edward L. Phair, Pauline Kleinschmidt, Leo Pottlitzer, John F. Pers, Allan F. Orourke, Julius H. Meyn, Warner P. Blackmun, Alfred A. Sherbb, Carl Kummer, Sylvia Otto, Francis Barney, C. B. Knapp, Vane R. Howard, Mae Heinley, J. E. Hathaway, Walter Thornton, D. Wasserman, Howard J. Gescheidler, Walter A. McNary, Mable Knipple, P. Boersma, P. Amaphony, Fred J. Gescheidler, Howard Gescheidler, Jr., Forrest R. Hobbs, C. Fry, M. Klein, S. C. Gettler, Leslie Meyers, Edmund H. Klein, Lawrence S. Ervin, Jean Koenes, William Lavin, M. Wilson, F. P. Dall, Gibson A. Meyer, J. Clinn Ellyson, Arthur E. Ebert, George W. Clark, Theodore Moor, Anthony D. Baker, Hammond, Ind.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, the people of Indiana have made a splendid and impressive contribution to the war effort. They will continue to do so; but they feel that they should be permitted to continue to use gasoline for essential purposes, and for the purposes of their businesses, because there is an abundant supply of gasoline in that area, and it is transported into and within the area only by means of trucks.

Mr. BREWSTER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I wonder if the Senator would feel that those for whom he speaks should continue to use their gasoline for nonessential purposes, if the supply on hand in that area could augment the gasoline needed for military requirements, of which there is a shortage.

Mr. WILLIS. I know the people of Indiana do not care to use a single gallon of gasoline which would contribute to the war effort, or which would relieve the shortage on the east coast; but, in view of the inadequacy of other means of transportation, they feel perfectly justified in asking that they may use the gasoline already in the vicinity, and already available. They feel it is not necessary to impose restrictions merely for the sake of regimentation or in order to indicate their sympathy with those suffering for lack of gasoline.

Mr. BREWSTER. I felt sure the Senator would be willing to cooperate.

Mr. WILLIS. I am, indeed.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to know whether the situation in Indiana is like that in North Dakota, which is about a thousand miles farther west.

Mr. WILLIS. I am not informed as to the situation in North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I shall tell the Senator what it is. I had a telephone call this morning from Mr. John R. Fleck, the State representative of the National Automobile Dealers Association, stating they have all the gasoline they need, hauling it from about 190 or 200 miles west of the State. They have the trucks available. There are high-school students who desire to work on the farms. There are men living in small towns who farm out in the country, 2 miles, 4 miles, 6 miles, 8 miles, who need gasoline to go to and from. Is the situation in Indiana like that in North Dakota?

Mr. WILLIS. It is very similar to it.

DEDICATION OF TWO LOCKS ON ST. MARYS RIVER

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, from the Committee on Commerce I report favorably House bill 1258, and I submit a report (No. 300) thereon.

If I may have the attention of the acting majority leader and the minority leader, the sole purpose of the bill is to officially name the two new locks which have been built at Sault Ste. Marie. There is no controversy about it. It is desired that the matter should be officially concluded at once, because the dedication is to occur on July 4, and I am asking whether there is any objection to the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. HILL. Did the bill have a unanimous report of the committee?

Mr. VANDENBERG. It did, of the Committee on Commerce and of the House of Representatives.

Mr. McNARY. I join in the request.

Mr. HILL. Under the circumstances, I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 1258) to name certain locks in the St. Marys River at the falls, Michigan, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2481) making appro-

priations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senator in charge of the pending bill, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell], I should like to state to him that I think he would be justified in giving notice that the Senate will remain in session today until it passes the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should be very happy to have the matter take that direction, if it appeals to the leaders of the majority and the minority.

Mr. McNARY. I think the notice should be given. The bill will have a long and rough road after it passes, and it is as important a bill as any that has been before the Senate. It is as important as the Navy appropriation bill or the Army appropriation bill. We must have food first. We have been considering the bill for several days, and it must go to conference, the conference report must be agreed to, and the bill must be signed by the President by the 30th of June. I think we should remain in session today until we finish the consideration of the bill, and if I were in charge of the bill, I would give notice to that effect, because it is proper to give such notice either the day before or early on the day when such an order is desired.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Georgia that, so far as I am concerned, I will cooperate with him to the fullest. If he wishes to give the notice now, and have the Senate remain in session until the consideration of the bill is completed, I will do everything I can to cooperate with him and uphold his hands in the matter.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no question that it is of the utmost importance to have the bill pass the Senate at the earliest possible date. We are several weeks later with the bill this year than we have been in times past. Last year the bill was not presented to the President until after the 1st of July, and that situation caused a great deal of confusion. The previous year the bill reached the President, due to the length of time we spent on it in conference between the House and the Senate, on the last day of the fiscal year. There will probably be more difficulties in the conference this year than there ever have been before, and we will require all the time possible in an effort to iron out the differences between the two bodies.

In view of the great importance of taking action on the bill at the earliest possible time I shall accept the suggestion of the two leaders, and I serve notice that I shall insist that the Senate remain in session today until action on the bill can be concluded.

VISIT TO THE SENATE OF HIS EXCELLENCY, GEN. EGINIO MORINIGO M., PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF PARAGUAY

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the President of Paraguay will shortly visit the Senate. I ask that the Chair appoint a committee to escort him to the floor of the Senate, and that then the Senate

stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALLGREN in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Chair appoints the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] as the committee to meet the President of Paraguay and escort him into the Chamber.

Pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senate will now stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

The Senate being in recess, at 12 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.,

His Excellency, Gen. Higinio Morínigo M., President of Paraguay, escorted by the committee appointed by the Vice President, consisting of Mr. HILL, Mr. McNARY, Mr. CONNALLY, and Mr. CAPPER, preceded by the Secretary of the Senate, Edwin A. Halsey, and the Sergeant at Arms, Wall Doxey, entered the Chamber and took the place assigned him on the rostrum in front of the Vice President's desk.

The members of the party accompanying the President of Paraguay, including His Excellency Señor Dr. Don Luis Argaña, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Paraguay; His Excellency Señor Dr. Don Rogelio Espinoza, Minister of Finance of Paraguay; Lt. Col. Victoriano Benítez Vera; Lt. Col. Manuel Rodríguez; Maj. Eugenio Reichert, aide-de-camp to the President of Paraguay; the Honorable Dr. Jorge Escobar, Under Secretary of Foreign Affairs of Paraguay; Lt. Comdr. Pedro Meyer, naval aide to the President of Paraguay; the Honorable Wesley Frost, American Ambassador to Paraguay; Brig. Gen. Charles L. Mullins, Jr., United States Army, military aide; Capt. Frank Loftin, United States Navy, naval aide; and R. D. Muir, Division of Protocol, Department of State, entered the Chamber and were escorted to the seats assigned them to the left of the Vice President's desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Members of the Senate, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I introduce to you the President of Paraguay.

[Applause, Senators and occupants of the galleries rising.]

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF PARAGUAY

His Excellency Gen. Higinio Morínigo M., President of Paraguay, addressed the Senate as follows:

Señor Presidente, Señores Senadores, bien está la suntuosidad del Capitolio para albergar entre sus muros gigantes las figuras próceres de las ilustres personalidades cuyas estatuas enfilan en la Rotonda como mudos guardianes de la impercedera tradición de esta Casa, de donde ha salido la sabia legislación democrática que tan marcada influencia ha ejercido en el progreso material y espiritual de esta gran Nación.

Elevado es el honor que significa para mí el ocupar esta tribuna, no precisamente como Presidente de una nación hermana de la vuestra, sino, sobre todo, como ciudadano de América, como miem-

bro de la gran familia constituida en torno a una causa común.

Los Estados Unidos de América se incorporaron a la vida independiente sobre la base de un programa bien definido, que aparece en el Acta de la Declaración de Independencia, de 1776, y es completado después por la Constitución Nacional, la Carta de Garantías Individuales y la oración de Gettysburg.

Dicha Declaración de Independencia es, a mi juicio, el documento más trascendental de su género. Empezaba con la enunciación del hermoso principio jurídico internacional según el cual "la independencia e igualdad de las naciones de la tierra es un derecho que emana de las leyes de la naturaleza y del Dios de esa naturaleza"; proclama, en el orden público, "que todos los hombres nacen libres; que a todos les confiere su Creador ciertos derechos inalienables entre los cuales están la vida, la libertad y la busca de la felicidad"; y sienta, en materia política, uno de los principios cardinales en los regímenes democráticos: "Que para garantizar estos derechos, los hombres instituyen gobiernos que deriven sus justos poderes del consentimiento de los gobernados."

Desde la fecha memorable de aquella declaración de Jefferson han pasado más de 166 años; y, sin embargo, aquellos principios siguen siendo piedras angulares de la construcción jurídica de los pueblos libres.

Los Estados Unidos de América se han anticipado en trece años a la Revolución Francesa, en la "Declaración de los derechos del hombre y del ciudadano," trasgada después a los demás países del Continente para estructurar las constituciones que modelaron las nuevas nacionalidades que forman la gran familia americana.

Mi patria, al igual que los otros países de América y siguiendo el ejemplo de la hermana mayor del Norte, adoptó la forma democrática de gobierno. Ha sido y es un país democrático desde las más remotas épocas de su historia. Fué paraguaya la revolución llamada de los Comuneros, quienes en 1727, mucho antes de promediar el siglo XVIII, ya habían proclamado, ante la faz del mundo, que la voluntad del común o pueblo debe estar por encima de todas las voluntades, como principio y emanación que es de las autoridades públicas.

Ha venido rigiéndose hasta 1939 por una de las constituciones más liberales del mundo.

Las nuevas cuestiones planteadas en el terreno del derecho puro inspiraron la reforma de 1939, para tratar de poner aquella ley fundamental en consonancia y asegurar un mayor bienestar general con las modernas conquistas del derecho. El problema no fué planteado como un abandono de la ruta seguida hasta entonces para campear por sendas distintas, sino como una rectificación de la marcha para procurar acelerarla convenientemente y alejar obstáculos y espejismos, de acuerdo con las modernas corrientes ideológicas y por el mismo procedimiento que habían puesto en práctica otros países americanos. No ha respondido a ninguna tendencia absolu-

tista sino al sano propósito de satisfacer una necesidad, sin desmedrar, como se expresa en la exposición de motivos, los principios cardinales de la democracia americana, consignados en la Constitución de Filadelfia.

Es indudable que el sistema democrático, como organización política y social, es el único que se conforma con la naturaleza del hombre; pero es también indudable que todo sistema o cuerpo de doctrina puede y debe ser modificado a la luz de la verdad, sin remover, claro está, la base de la construcción jurídica para no caer en el absurdo de pretender sostener la fábrica en el aire. "El conocimiento de la verdad," lo dice una inscripción burilada en el frontispicio de la galería central de la Biblioteca de este Congreso, "es el bien soberano de la naturaleza humana."

Con lo dicho, no he querido significar que se trate de una obra acabada. Antes, por el contrario, creo que la reforma no carece de errores y omisiones. Tal es la razón por la cual he propiciado últimamente una revisión de la misma, en consulta hecha al pueblo de mi país con resultado favorable, y siempre en vista de los principios básicos de una verdadera democracia.

La edad contemporánea en la división cronológica de la historia universal, arranca de la Revolución Francesa. Lo justo, en mi sentir, hubiera sido tomar como punto de partida la fecha de la Independencia de los Estados Unidos de América, de la aprobación, por el Segundo Congreso Continental, de las hermosas declaraciones a que he aludido hace un momento, por lo menos en América, donde aquella simiente de libertad ha germinado en instituciones que honran a los pueblos que forman la comunidad americana, al amparo de idénticas inquietudes cívicas y de comunes aspiraciones.

A la vista de los acontecimientos producidos en los últimos diez años, acaso no sea aventurado afirmar que una nueva era histórica se ha iniciado en el Nuevo Mundo. Recordaré solamente dos de dichos acontecimientos:

Primero.—El advenimiento de la política de la "Buena Vecindad" que nació con la asunción del mando por el Presidente Roosevelt cuando desde los umbrales de este Capitolio dijo que, en el campo de las relaciones internacionales dedicaría esta Nación a la política "de un buen vecino que se respete a sí mismo y que, por hacerlo así, respete los derechos de los otros; de un vecino que en un mundo de vecinos, haga honor a sus obligaciones y a la santidad de sus convenios."

Y segundo. La consolidación del Panamericanismo, desde la Primera Reunión de Ministros de Relaciones Exteriores, en Panamá en 1939, hasta la Tercera de Río de Janeiro, de 1942, y cuyo resultado inmediato ha sido la más grandiosa cooperación de los países americanos que registra la historia, para defenderse del peligro común que golpeó sus puertas con el ataque alevoso de Pearl Harbor, luchar por el mantenimiento de los eternos principios de la libertad y de la justicia, que gobiernan la convivencia social.

y propender a la formación de un mundo mejor que el presente, sobre la base del respeto de la moral y el derecho y la observancia de una real confraternidad, como principios esenciales de la democracia.

El Paraguay ha cumplido y cumplirá fiel y honradamente todos sus compromisos internacionales. Ha roto sus relaciones diplomáticas, económicas y financieras con las naciones del Eje, antes que la Tercera Reunión de Cancilleres de Río de Janeiro clausurara sus sesiones.

Respetuoso de su tradición y fervoroso partidario de los principios enunciados, no ha titubeado ni un solo instante para ponerse del lado de los Estados Unidos de América y de las otras naciones hermanas en la más espantosa tragedia que haya concebido la imaginación y recuerda la historia de todos los tiempos.

El pueblo paraguayo reafirma, por mi intermedio, en esta ocasión solemne, su adhesión a la causa de este glorioso país, que es causa de América, y rinde su homenaje al heroísmo de sus esforzados combatientes por la libertad y la justicia.

[Prolonged applause, Senators, distinguished visitors, and occupants of the galleries rising.]

The English translation of the address by the President of the Republic of Paraguay is as follows:

Mr. President and Members of the Senate of the United States, the magnificence of the Capitol is fitting to shelter within its gigantic walls the outstanding figures of the illustrious persons whose statues stand in the rotunda as mute guardians of the imperishable traditions of this House from which has emanated the wise democratic legislation that has exercised such marked influence on the material and spiritual progress of this great Nation.

It signifies a high honor for me to occupy this rostrum, not only as President of your sister nation, but above all as a citizen of the Americas, as a member of the great family of nations united around a common cause.

The United States of America entered into an independent life on the basis of a well-defined program that appears in the Declaration of Independence of 1776, completed later by the Constitution and by the Bill of Rights and the Gettysburg Address.

The Declaration of Independence is, in my opinion, the most transcendental document of its kind. It begins with the enunciation of the fine international juridical principle according to which "the separate and equal station of the nations of the world is a right to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitled them"; it proclaims in the public order "that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," and it establishes in political matters one of the cardinal principles of democratic regimes, "that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." Since the memorable date of that Jeffersonian declaration more than 166 years have passed, and still

those principles continue to be the foundation stones of the juridical structure of the free people.

Thirteen years before the French Revolution, the United States of America had set forth the principles of the Bill of Rights, which later served as a model to the new nations of the great American family in the framing of their constitutions.

My country, together with the other countries of America, and following the example of the older sister from the north, adopted a democratic form of government. It has been and is a democratic country since the early days of its history. Paraguayan in origin was the revolution of the Comuneros which in 1727, long before the middle of the eighteenth century, proclaimed to the whole world that the will of the common people must be above all other wills, as a principle which belongs to public authority.

Up until 1939 Paraguay had governed itself by one of the most liberal constitutions in the world.

The new questions which arose in the field of pure law inspired the reform of 1939, in order to place that fundamental law in harmony with the modern conquest of law; and assure a greater well-being. The problem was not stated with a view to abandoning the road followed up to then and traveling by a different one, but with a view to modifying the direction and trying to expedite it in a convenient way, leaving out obstacles and illusions, in accordance with the modern ideologies, and in line with the processes that other American countries had established. It has not followed any absolutist tendency, but the sound purpose of satisfying a need without impairing, as stated in the declaration of purposes, the cardinal principles of American democracy contained in the Philadelphia Constitution.

There is no doubt that the democratic system, as a political and social organization, is the only one which conforms with man's nature; but it is also true that any system or body or doctrine can and must be modified in the light of truth without removing, of course, the bases of the juridical structure so that it may not err by trying to operate in a vacuum. "The inquiry, knowledge, and belief of truth," as stated in an inscription in the facade of the central gallery of the Library of this Congress, "is the sovereign good of human nature."

I do not need to state that we are not dealing with a finished work. Rather, I believe in the reform of its flaws and omissions. That is why I have advocated recently its revision, after consulting my people with favorable results, and always considering the basic principles of a true democracy.

In the chronological division of universal history, the contemporary age starts with the French Revolution. The fair thing in my opinion would have been to take as the starting point the date of the independence of the United States of America, of the approval, by the Second Continental Congress, of the outstanding statements to which I have just referred, at least in America, where the seed of

liberty has sprouted into institutions which honor the peoples that are a part of the American community and that live under the same civic preoccupation and the same common aspirations.

In the light of events in the United States during the past 10 years, it may not be unreasonable to state that a new era in history has begun in the New World. Let me review but two of these events:

First, The inception of the good-neighbor policy, coincidental with the inauguration of President Roosevelt, who, from the rostrum of this Capitol said that in the field of international relations he dedicated this Nation to the "good neighbor who respects himself and who, therefore, respects the rights of others; the neighbor who, in a world of neighbors, honors his obligations and the sanctity of his word."

And, second, the consolidation of pan-Americanism, from the first meeting of foreign ministers in Panama in 1939, to the third such meeting, in Rio de Janeiro in 1942, the immediate result of which was the most magnificent cooperation of the American countries ever recorded in history, for the purpose of defending themselves against the common danger which struck against them with the treacherous attack on Pearl Harbor, of struggling for the maintenance of the undying principles of liberty and justice which govern their living together, and of aiming at the formation of a world better than the present one on the basis of respect for the principles of ethics and law and of the practice of a true fraternity, as principles essential to a democracy.

Paraguay has kept and will continue to keep faithfully and honorably all her international pledges. Even before the third meeting of foreign ministers in Rio had come to a close, she had broken all diplomatic, economic, and financial ties with the Axis.

Respectful of her tradition and an active advocate of the principles expressed, she has not hesitated a single moment to put herself on the side of the United States and the other United Nations in the greatest tragedy which the imagination has conceived and which history has recorded in all time.

The Paraguayan people reaffirm, through me, in this solemn occasion, their adherence to the cause of this glorious country, which is also the cause of all America, and pay homage to the heroism of its brave fighting men in the fight for liberty and justice.

Following his address, the President of Paraguay and the distinguished visitors accompanying him were escorted from the Chamber.

At 12 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m., the Senate reassembled, when it was called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. WALLGREN in the chair).

LIDICE

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, 1 year ago this afternoon a group of individuals from the Nazi Army entered the little town of Lidice, in Czechoslovakia, and exterminated hundreds of innocent people living in that simple village. When

those human beasts had finished their dastardly deed they proclaimed that Lidice had been wiped off the face of the earth. But, Mr. President, the effect of those cruel acts has been just the opposite of what the leader of that murderous gang said it would be. Lidice lives in the hearts of all the civilized world. In Illinois, for instance, my home State, a little village has been named Lidice out of sympathy for the people who died at the hands of those vicious monsters.

Today there appears in the New York Times an editorial entitled "Not Extinguished." The editorial is highly illuminating and interesting, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOT EXTINGUISHED

A year ago this afternoon German troops began to gather along the roads leading into a little Bohemian village not far from Prague. Few persons outside of Bohemia had ever heard the name of this village, but it was dear to those who lived in it. On the previous day Reinhard Heydrich, who had earned the love and admiration of many Germans by killing a great multitude of helpless and innocent people, had been buried in the Invaliden Cemetery in Berlin. He had lingered a week in agony after two men, who were never captured and whose names were never known, had jumped on the running board of his car on the road from Berlin to Prague and fired two bullets into his spine—or perhaps threw a grenade which had the same effect. By the afternoon of June 10 the Nazis, by their own story, had killed 261 Czechs in revenge for Heydrich. They killed women. They killed authors and professors. But they were not satisfied. Shortly before 8 o'clock, a year ago tonight, armed men—it would be an insult to a stern but honorable profession to call them soldiers—began to move into the little Bohemian village.

That same evening (the exact sequence of events is not quite clear, but apparently the troops were at their work in the village at that time) the Berlin radio announced that arms, an illegal radio station, subversive printed material, and hoards of rationed commodities had been discovered. It then stated:

"After these facts had been ascertained all male adults of the town were shot, while the women were placed in a concentration camp, and the children were entrusted to appropriate educational institutions. The township was leveled to the ground and the name of the community extinguished. The inhabitants of Lidice, near Kladno, No. 483."

A year has gone by. There is no spot on earth where a free press exists that the name of this obscure little village is not known. It has become a part of every language. The poor, humble folk who died there are immortal. They are in every town in occupied Europe. They march with every army. They will gather on every road and behind every hedge, rock, and tree when the great Nazi retreat begins. If there is any wavering on any front, any faint cry of appeasement, it is they who will go silently forward with their bayonets, making sure of no compromise, no mercy for butchers. The armed men who were at Lidice, in Bohemia, on the evening of June 10, 1942, those who sent them there, those who committed similar crimes in other places, and those who ordered such crimes, will then know that the Berlin broadcast erred in one particular. The community of Lidice was not extinguished.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, let me say in conclusion just one further word:

Out of the ashes of the holocaust we are now fighting throughout the world it is my prayer and my hope that villages like Lidice that have been overrun, whose people have been murdered and property completely destroyed, may be reconstructed and firmly and impregnably established in the future, for all time to come. It is my hope that valiant nations such as Czechoslovakia and other small nations that have been conquered by ruthless, totalitarian despots may once again take their rightful place in a civilized world where peace, amity, and good will shall reign forever.

THE CRITICAL CANNED-FOOD SITUATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, at the beginning of the session today we heard the statement that the passage of the pending bill was the most important matter before the Senate, and that the Senate should promptly complete the consideration of the bill. I hesitate to trespass on the time of the Senate, but I desire to bring again to its attention the same subject on which I spoke yesterday. That is the importance of getting food into cans for our own people and for our armed forces. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a statement which came to my desk, and in which a gentleman from my State sums up his experience during the past week, after visiting various agencies and divisions in Washington. He says:

I give you a digest of the conversation. It is as follows:

"Question. Can you supply male help for our canning plant to preserve food?"

"Answer. No, no help for canning plants, only for the farmers."

"Question. Then, will you allow me to pay enough wages to get the help?"

"Answer. No, not for the canning plants. You can increase wages on the farms and in defense plants, but not in the canning plants."

Mr. President, I repeat what I said yesterday, that this Government must take action within the next few weeks, or else a great portion of the pea crop of the country will not be canned, and then will come the other crops—corn, cabbage, and so forth.

Let me read into the RECORD a letter which very graphically depicts a critical situation. It comes from Martin Meeter, of Union Grove, Wis.

JUNE 7, 1943.

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Our canning plant is located at Union Grove, Wis., a village of less than 1,000 inhabitants.

We receive between six and seven thousand tons of vegetables for canning.

Since last winter we have tried desperately to obtain relief on the matter of wages and manpower as we realize that this rural district will not furnish enough help to preserve the crops in the canning plant this year.

Now it appears that the situation is so serious we will have to close up the plant.

The War Labor Board has refused our repeated requests for wage increases to meet current wage levels in that area. Defense plants in Racine are paying 90 cents per hour for common labor. This canning plant must pick up 40 or 50 men and 150 to 200 women during the canning season beginning the first of August on tomatoes.

We have been packing several hundred thousands cases of canned vegetables for the military and lend-lease and have commitments for this year.

A recent Government ruling permits an increase of 10 cents per hour above the wage being paid in the canning plant at the close of last year's packing season. This for common labor would equal 60 cents per hour in our plant. We know, of course, that no one in that area would work for 60 cents an hour in a canning plant, a temporary job, when he can obtain 90 cents per hour in a defense plant nearby.

Now on top of all this, Government is building a \$250,000 hemp plant in the same village. The construction company is about to begin this work and must complete this construction before October 1. They will use all the available common labor in the country and are offering to pay \$1.10 per hour.

Mr. Senator, this is about the last straw. We have tried to organize and are organizing a food army in this village, including some businessmen and many valiant patriotic women who will do all they can. But you can't run a canning plant such as this with all inexperienced help.

We have lost quite a few men who have gone into the service, others to farms as farmers have been permitted to pay higher wages, and to defense plants. Even at this time we have not enough help left to finish packing some canned sauerkraut on last year's Government orders. Then what will the situation be when perishable tomatoes arrive in August? I have contracted for a good many thousand tons of tomatoes and cabbage for kraut which is now being planted. What am I going to do with it?

We have worked on this matter for several months, hopefully thinking that the proper agencies in Washington would permit us to pay comparative wages or assist in some manner to get the necessary manpower. We have worked diligently with the United States Employment Service at Racine, who admitted to me a few days ago that they were all through—they can't do anything for us at such wage levels.

Through our canners' associations and in person we have appealed again and again for relief—the matter of adequate wages and manpower—but now all doors seem to be closed.

It seems we have to choose between two things: Either we pack the food and violate the law, or we obey the law and lose the food.

This is no idle threat. I cannot ask even those few men I have left to work for us at such inadequate wages when they can walk right out of the plant and get 30 to 40 cents per hour more. Everyone of them has a family to support.

If it was an ordinary business venture we would close up the plant, but this means food for our boys out there and for the Nation, and this must not be. But I see no alternative. What am I to do?

Yours very truly,

MARTIN MEETER,
MEETER'S, INC.,
Union Grove, Wis.

One man says:

I called my men together in the factory a few days ago. They are men with families, who have worked in the factory from 5 to 12 years, just like a family group. We call each other by our first names. Can you imagine what a pleasant task it was for me to explain I could do nothing more for them, that I knew every man in the group could walk out and get 30 cents per hour more across the street in a war plant, and 40 to 50 to 60 cents more by going into the hemp plant that the Government is putting up, putting \$250,000 of its own money into it.

The Government is stealing men away from food production, and is granting no relief. We must get help to the canners. Let me repeat what one man says:

If it were an ordinary business venture, we would close up the plant, but this means food for our boys out there and for the Nation.

Recently former President Hoover spoke on the subject of food. An editorial entitled "Program for Food," was published in last evening's Washington Star. The editorial comments on former President Hoover's statement. I ask that the editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROGRAM FOR FOOD

Herbert Hoover, addressing the American Farm Bureau Federation in New York, issued a solemn warning that our food supply is decreasing while the demand for food, at the same time, is rising rapidly. The former President, who was Food Administrator for the United States during the last war and today is a keen student of the food problem, made a series of recommendations which deserve serious consideration.

The program suggested by Mr. Hoover is designed to give this country its maximum production of food. This must be assured, not only to maintain the American people and to win the war, but to make it possible to provide food for millions of persons in the United Nations and other millions in countries that have been overrun by the Axis Powers. There can be no lasting peace without food.

Chief among the recommendations is that forty or fifty million more acres be planted in 1944 than in this year. Only by greatly increased planting will it be possible to produce more and more foodstuffs. During the period from 1932 to 1939 the administration, by its restrictive policies toward agriculture, reduced the acreage of 17 leading crops planted in this country by 47,000,000 acres. Farmers were paid not to produce. It is idle now to comment on the folly of the economy of scarcity. The thing to do is to get away from it—and never to return. These 17 crops constitute about 95 percent of the whole harvested area.

It seems incredible but it is nevertheless true, as Mr. Hoover pointed out, that after the passage of the Lease-Lend Act the Government undertook to increase food production but at the same time continued payments to farmers to restrict production. These restrictive payments were not removed until this spring. In some cases they still persist.

Mr. Hoover also includes in his recommendations a proposal that one agency, headed by one man, take over the whole administration of the food problem. At present nine agencies of the Government are telling the farmers, the food distributors, and wholesalers and retailers what to do about production, distribution, and prices. The result, in Mr. Hoover's opinion, is chaos.

In order to increase the farm-planting acreage, it will be necessary to have increased farm labor and more farm machinery. Declaring that the present price system is stifling farm production, Mr. Hoover proposed that the retail and wholesale price ceilings be done away with. Price fixing must begin as near the source of production as possible, and from there on regulations against profiteering must be placed upon the trades. Prices to the farmers must include floors as well as ceilings, and the prices must take into account labor and other costs. Such

a plan would be calculated really to stimulate production.

In 1942 we had bumper crops. This year the harvest is likely to be normal—which means that the actual production of food will be considerably below the crop we have just about eaten up. There is nothing that can be done to meet this situation immediately. The plantings for the following crop, however, will be of vast importance.

If the statistics for the crops of the last year are correct, then in the opinion of Mr. Hoover, some bureaucracy has strangled the flow of food from the farm to the housewife. This is the only explanation of reports that have come from all sections of the country showing scarcity of foods. And if this be true, the sooner the hand of bureaucracy is lifted the better.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate, and the majority and minority leaders give consideration to the matter of getting labor into the canning plants. I ask it not for the canners, but for my country. I ask it because if we do not, as was stated yesterday, the most valuable munition of the country, namely, food, will not be there when the armed forces need it and when the country needs it. The situation is so critical that I trust some action will be taken by the appropriate arm of Government to the end that these factories may get the necessary labor.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2409) making appropriations for the legislative branch and for the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. HENDRICKS, Mr. GORE, Mr. KIRWAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana, Mr. H. CARL ANDERSON, and Mr. FLOESER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2753) making supplemental appropriations to carry out the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. LAMBERTSON, and Mr. DITTE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2795. A bill to amend the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, to provide for the more efficient utilization and disposition of Government property other than land or buildings and facilities or fixtures appurtenant thereto, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 134. Joint resolution to continue the temporary increases in postal rates on first-class matter, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 2664. An act to provide for the training of nurses for the armed forces, governmental and civilian hospitals, health agencies, and war industries, through grants to institutions providing such training, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 133. Joint resolution to permit additional sales of wheat for feed.

HOUSE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bill and joint resolution were each read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 2795. A bill to amend the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, to provide for the more efficient utilization and disposition of Government property other than land or buildings and facilities or fixtures appurtenant thereto, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. J. Res. 134. Joint resolution to continue the temporary increases in postal rates on first-class matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2714) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 59.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 36, 38, 39, 40, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, and 58; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$4,497,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lines 11, 12, and 13 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out the proviso.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"BITUMINOUS COAL DIVISION

"For the Bituminous Coal Division, fiscal year 1943, in carrying out the purposes of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937, as amended (15 U. S. C. 828-849), as further amended by the Act of April 24, 1943 (Public Law 40), and as further amended, to be supplemental to and merged with the appropriation under this head in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1943, and to be available for the

same objects of expenditure, \$700,000, to continue available during the fiscal year 1944."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 5, 8, 37, 41, 60, and 61.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
R. B. RUSSELL,
GERALD P. NYE,
H. C. LODGE, Jr.,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

CLARENCE CANNON,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
EMMETT O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JED JOHNSON,
JOHN TAHER,

R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2714) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

June 8, 1943.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 8, 37, and 41 to the bill (H. R. 2714) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In the last line of the matter inserted by said Senate engrossed amendment, after "Department" insert "or the Department of State or the Office of Strategic Services"; and

That the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 60 and 61 to said bill.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, it will be noted that the House amended Senate amendment No. 5 by adding to the exceptions the State Department and the Office of Strategic Services. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment with an amendment, as follows:

At the end of the matter inserted by the House amendment, and before the period, insert "or the Federal Bureau of Investigation."

Undoubtedly that Bureau should be included as an exception.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to.

LXXXIX—353

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate further insist on Senate amendment No. 5, as amended.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I move that the Senate further insist on its amendment No. 60, which is the only amendment of substance now in disagreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to explain to the Senate that Senate amendment No. 60, as to which there is disagreement, relates to the action of the House in providing that no part of the appropriation should be used to pay the salaries of Mr. Watson, Mr. Dodd, and Dr. Lovett. The Senate is familiar with this matter. The Senate struck out this provision in the House bill after the House had adopted it by an enormous majority, as I recall by a vote of 3 to 1, or 2 to 1, and since that time the House, by voice vote, has practically unanimously insisted upon retaining the provision. It is necessary for the Senate conferees to have a yea-and-nay vote so as to know what the will of the Senate is before we go into the conference. Therefore, in order to bring the question before the Senate, I ask for the yeas and nays on my motion. So far as I am concerned, I am not taking any position one way or the other, but I wish to have the judgment of the Senate. I move that the Senate further insist on its amendment No. 60, and I ask for the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MCKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I am not certain that I thoroughly understand the explanation with respect to the last amendment to which the Senator from Tennessee referred. Will the Senator be so kind as to repeat his explanation of the amendment?

Mr. MCKELLAR. I shall be very glad to do so.

The House adopted an amendment which became a part of the House bill providing that no part of the appropriation carried in this bill shall be used to pay the salaries of Goodwin B. Watson, William E. Dodd, Jr., and Robert Morris Lovett. That amendment was agreed to in the House by an overwhelming majority—about three to one. It came over to the Senate and the Senate committee struck it out. Following the recommendation of its committee, the Senate struck out the House provision, and the amendment went to conference. Since then the House has voted to insist upon its disagreement to the Senate amendment. As I recall, the vote was almost unanimous. Therefore I wish to get the sense of the Senate by a yea-and-nay vote so that the Senate conferees may know exactly how the Senate feels about it.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MCKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. Did the Senate committee before striking out the House pro-

vision, investigate the facts as did the House?

Mr. MCKELLAR. Yes; it investigated the facts. The conferees had additional facts which were not before the Senate committee. They were brought before the conference so that both sides were fully advised, and I believe every Senator is fully advised about the question. I wish to have the sense of the Senate on the question before the amendment again goes to conference.

Mr. LUCAS and Mr. OVERTON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield, and if so to whom?

Mr. MCKELLAR. I yield first to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. It is my understanding that when the Senate Appropriations Committee reported the bill there were no facts on this matter before the Appropriations Committee, but they were to ascertain what the facts really were when they got into conference.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Oh, no. We had a great deal of testimony brought before the committee when the matter was before it. We had all the facts except some on which the House acted, which were regarded as being secret. But afterward, in the conference, those secret facts were brought before the conference committee.

Mr. LUCAS. Were those secret facts, which apparently no one can find out about, developed by the Kerr committee?

Mr. MCKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. Why is it that the Senate, as a whole, may not know what those facts are?

Mr. MCKELLAR. The evidence is very voluminous, and it would take quite a while to state it. I see no reason in the world why it should be secret.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate that, and I am not blaming the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I understand.

Mr. LUCAS. It is a very peculiar and unusual case. Evidence was taken by the Kerr committee of the House of Representatives, against three individuals, and no one, with the exception of those who were members of the Kerr committee, and those who were members of the conference committee, can find out what the facts are with respect to these three men. To me, this is most significant.

Mr. MCKELLAR. The evidence was very voluminous. It was undertaken to show before the committee that these three men were members of the Communist Party, and that one man was a member of several score organizations which were more or less subversive—I believe that is the word that is used—and there was much ado about it. Much of the testimony was from the three witnesses themselves. They were brought before that committee. We read their explanations. I think the Senator can easily understand what the nature of the testimony was. There was plenty of testimony adduced on all sides in order that the committee could make up its mind.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I wish to make a brief statement in conclusion. No Member of the Senate is more opposed to the subversive elements in this country than is the Senator from Illinois. However, I will not vote blindly to discharge three individuals from Government employment upon secret testimony which was developed by the Kerr committee of the House of Representatives, and about which the Senate knows nothing.

Apparently these men are being discharged from appointive positions because of what was developed before the Kerr committee, the Senate being denied the opportunity to peruse that evidence. To discharge the men under such circumstances is tantamount to convicting them as being Communists without a hearing or trial.

Mr. President, I say that this is a dangerous precedent for the Senate to establish, or even consider, and I shall not be a party to it. It does violence to fundamental principles of free government. If I had all the facts which were disclosed to the Kerr committee, and had an opportunity to analyze them, I might reach a different conclusion; but I do not intend blindly to vote to condemn individuals who are on the public pay roll at the present time, brand and classify them among those who seek by subversive measures to overthrow the Government, without clear and convincing evidence. That is what it means. I simply cannot do that.

Mr. McKELLAR. If I understand the Senator from Illinois, he will vote for the motion which I am now making to insist further on amendment No. 60?

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. Such action will be in accord with the desire of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, before the vote is taken, I wish to make a statement as to my understanding of the case involving these three men. I am a member of the Appropriations Committee, and was a member of the subcommittee which considered this bill. When the bill came to the Senate from the House of Representatives it contained this provision barring the further employment of these three men. There was not a scintilla of evidence in the House hearings taken by the subcommittee in charge of this bill with reference to any one of the three men.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is entirely correct.

Mr. OVERTON. I took the position in the committee hearing, and I still take the position that we ought not to condemn any citizen of the United States without charges being preferred against him, giving him opportunity to appear and to be heard, and certainly without any evidence in support of the condemnation pronounced against him by the bill passed by the other House. My recollection is that not one of these three men appeared before our subcommittee,

but there were those who appeared in their defense.

Mr. McKELLAR. Notably, Secretary Ickes and a number of other gentlemen.

Mr. OVERTON. The only evidence we had was in exculpation of these individuals, and no one appeared before the subcommittee of the Senate making any charges of subversive influences against these men or charges of any character. Therefore the record is bare of any charges and bare of any evidence against any of them.

If they are, as has been suggested, Communists, if they belong to an organization that advocates the overthrow of the Government, we have in every legislation appropriation bill a provision under which each one of them can be brought to the bar of justice. I shall quote from the provision which appears in every appropriation act as the Senator from Tennessee well knows:

No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence—

That, let me say by way of inference, is merely prima facie evidence, and is put in there in order to protect the disbursing officer who pays those who are employed by the Government out of the appropriations contained in the appropriation acts.

Provided further, That such administrative or supervisory employees of the Department as may be designated for the purpose by the Secretary are hereby authorized to administer the oaths to persons making affidavits required by this section, and they shall charge no fee for so doing: *Provided further*, That any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained in this act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

Those are the pertinent parts of the provision which I wish to read to the Senate.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. OVERTON. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. One of these men, Mr. Dodd, comes from Virginia. He is the son of a former Ambassador to Germany. Am I to understand that these three men were called before the committee to make statements?

Mr. OVERTON. None of them appeared before the House committee considering the appropriation bill in which they have been condemned, and none appeared before the Senate committee.

Mr. BYRD. Is there any evidence before the committee that they are members of communistic organizations?

Mr. OVERTON. There was none before the Senate committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, just a moment. I think Secretary Ickes testified that, so far as one of them was concerned—Dr. Lovett—that Dr. Lovett's principal difficulty in his mind was that he belonged to too many organizations, or something of that kind. That was the extent to which he admitted that he belonged to a number of these organizations.

Mr. BYRD. He said he belonged to communistic organizations?

Mr. McKELLAR. Organizations which were communistically inclined. It depends upon who has the say-so as to whether an organization is communistic.

Mr. BYRD. Did he say that Mr. Lovett belonged to organizations which were inclined to overthrow democracy in this country?

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I listened to the testimony of Secretary Ickes, and he did make the statement that the trouble with the man was that he was a joiner; he would join anything that came along; but I do not think he pointed out any communistic organization with which he had been affiliated.

Mr. BYRD. If the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Tennessee, in whom I have the most supreme confidence, can say that any of these men are actual members of a Communist organization, I intend to support the movement to dismiss them from the Government service, if that is the only way to bring about their dismissal. Of course, I think the Department should dismiss them, but if the Department refuses to dismiss them, knowing them to be members of communistic organizations, while I disapprove of this method, I must say that I should vote to let the Congress dismiss them by means of the cancellation of the appropriation. What I want to know is, Is there any evidence which has been brought to the attention of the committee which is conclusive to the Senator from Louisiana that any of these men are members of communistic organizations?

Mr. OVERTON. It is my recollection that the testimony failed to show that any one of them was affiliated with any communistic organization. I may be in error.

Mr. BYRD. That was the charge made in the House of Representatives, was it not, when the matter was considered there?

Mr. OVERTON. It was not made before the Appropriations Committee handling this bill. I understand that there was an investigation made by the Kerr committee, and the Kerr committee made a report, but the evidence in support of the report has never been laid before either the House or the Senate. What are the facts according to the report, I do not know, and I doubt if any other Senator knows. I have never read it. According to my recollection, there was no evidence at all presented against any one of these three men that they were

affiliated with any communistic organization.

Mr. BYRD. Is it the opinion of the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Louisiana that none of these men are affiliated with or are members of any communistic organization?

Mr. OVERTON. If I may answer, I will say that it is my opinion that there is no evidence whatsoever to show that any of them was connected with any communistic organization. That is my recollection; I may be in error.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield so that I may ask a question of the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator from Louisiana has already partly answered the question which I desired to ask him. It is a fact, is it not, that these men have been condemned so far as the action of one body is concerned, without any hearing whatever, except in star-chamber proceedings, the records of which are not available to the membership even of the Committee on Appropriations of the House or the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, or to the ordinary mine-run Members of the Senate or House? In other words, we do not know on what basis the so-called Kerr committee arrived at its conclusion that these men were disqualified to hold office.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator is correct, according to all the information I have.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not hold a brief for any of these men. It may be that they are not fit to hold office, but, so far as I am concerned, I would not convict at all in the absence of evidence which was conclusive to my mind that the men concerned were guilty. This is essentially a penal proceeding, a most extraordinary penal proceeding, whereby it is asked that the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States, composing the Congress of the United States, pass judgment upon men, as I have said, in an essentially penal proceeding, certainly imposing moral obloquy upon them, without knowing what we are doing.

I do not know any of these men. I may say that some of the public activities of some of them are activities of which I have not approved, some of their expressed opinions are opinions of which I do not approve, but as to Dr. Lovett, I do know that his son was a gallant soldier in the Second Division in the World War, and was killed at the Battle of Belleau Wood. It is going to be very hard to make me believe that a man whose son gave his life for his country in the last war in a very gallant fighting division, is guilty of undertaking to tear down the Government of the United States. I certainly am not willing to reach any such opinion in the absence of specific evidence conclusive to my own mind.

It seems to me that it is a most extraordinary and reprehensible practice to condemn men who have never had a hearing in the open, on evidence about which we know nothing, or undertake to

shift the burden of proof to the shoulders of the Senator from Louisiana, the Senator from Tennessee, or any other respected Senator, trying to make them give a guaranty that these men have not been guilty. It seems to me the burden of proof is on someone to prove that they are not qualified, and if they are connected with any organization interested in tearing down the Government of the United States, that is adequately already taken care of in the law to which the Senator from Louisiana has referred.

Mr. OVERTON. I thoroughly agree with the observations made by the Senator from Missouri. As I understand the situation, these men are being condemned without any hearing, and without any evidence whatsoever, insofar as the committee is concerned.

There is no one who abhors communism more than I do.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I should like to associate myself with the Senator from Louisiana in that expression.

Mr. OVERTON. I abhor any organization which advocates the overthrow of the United States Government by force of arms, so much so, as the Senator from Missouri may recall, that I busied myself in preparing the very clause which I read, and, without much difficulty, got the committee of the Senate to adopt it in the first act in which it was adopted, and agreed to in conference, and it has been incorporated in every similar act since. If these men are Communists, under this clause they cannot be employed, they cannot be paid, and they are subject to trial and sentence before the courts of justice of the land.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. But they are entitled to a day in court, which they are not being accorded under this procedure.

Mr. OVERTON. Certainly they are entitled to a day in court.

I thank the Senator from Tennessee for yielding.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Washington asked me to yield, and I am glad to yield.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, it seems to me that this sort of procedure should be challenging to every lawyer in this body, and there are some very able lawyers in the Senate, and men who have served on the bench. I think every one of them must shrink at the contemplation of a proceeding which amounts to a bill of attainder, in the absence of any formal hearing, or the production of any proof which would be convincing and persuasive.

Like my colleague the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Lucas], I have not heard any of the testimony or evidence, and in the light of what the able Senator from Louisiana has said, it puts us in a peculiar light to sit here as a jury and approve what has been done. Gentlemen of the Senate, we constitute ourselves a jury, and in the absence of any facts at all being presented to us, we lawyers in this body would be placing ourselves in the position of doing a thing we would indict vigorously if a court in our own community should attempt to do it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Under those circumstances, Mr. President, the Senator should certainly vote for the motion I have made, which is to insist upon the Senate amendment striking out the House action.

Mr. BONE. In the light of what has been said within the past 10 minutes, I should be constrained to follow that course.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. I wish to make a brief observation as a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. McNARY. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McNARY. However important the consideration of this matter, the appropriation bill is more important. The matter now being considered relates to a bill which is in conference, and we are delaying consideration of a most important bill before the Senate, and if it is to take long, I shall ask that the Senate resume the consideration of the agricultural appropriation bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope we can have a vote. I wish to answer a question asked by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd]. Secretary Ickes testified before the committee and said it was claimed there were a number of subversive organizations to which one of these men belonged, but that he did not think they were subversive. That was the testimony about the matter.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. We heard one of these witnesses a year ago—Dr. Watson, I believe. He testified that he was thoroughly American; that he belonged to no communistic organization; that some of the liberal groups he joined may have afterward been influenced by certain communistic members, but that he and his father were lifelong workers in the church, that they both were ministers of religion, that his mother was engaged in religious work throughout her life, that he was an ex-service man himself; and furthermore that he was recommended very highly by the chief of the governmental agency with which he is connected. I do not believe any of these three men has been given the opportunity he deserves, and I do not believe the Senate should take action in a high-handed affair such as this presents itself to be.

Mr. President, I am against anyone working for the Government who is in favor of overthrowing the Government, but I think the integrity of the Senate is such that we should do as the Senator from Missouri has said—give these men a chance before we take summary action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Tennessee. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Oregon thinks we should not take any

more time on this matter. I know the Senator from Massachusetts is in favor of the motion, which is to insist on the Senate amendment and thereby instruct the conferees. So may we not have a vote now?

Mr. LODGE. The Senator from Tennessee does not want to be the only Senator to talk; does he?

Mr. McKELLAR. I want the bill to go back to conference after the vote is taken, if the Senator understands what I mean.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, this is one of the most unusual requests I have heard since I have been a Member of the Senate. I have been in the Senate only 7 years, but I have never heard made a request quite like that of the Senator from Tennessee. So far as I recall, no one on the minority side has expressed himself on this matter, though a number of very able speeches, to be sure, have been made by Senators on the majority side. I do not believe the Senator from Tennessee wants to deprive the members of the minority of the opportunity to make their views plain on this question. In State legislatures there is the right to move the previous question, thereby shutting off all debate. That privilege does not exist in the Senate, and if it should ever be put into effect, I think it should apply to both sides.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to say to the Senator that there is no objection to a continuance of the debate. If I made such a suggestion, I withdraw it.

Mr. LODGE. As a conferee, and as a member of the subcommittee, I thought it was incumbent upon me to say one or two words about this matter. I try not to burden the Senate with long speeches. In fact, I do not think I have ever made a lengthy speech in the Senate.

In my study and scrutiny of this matter I did not find justification for the procedure followed by the House. No evidence was submitted to us that these men were particularly dangerous. I may add that no evidence was submitted to show that these men were particularly well qualified for the positions which they hold, and I certainly cannot share in some of the crocodile tears which are being shed in support of these men. But obviously it is an unsound procedure for Congress to attempt to discipline officials in the executive department of the Government who have been legally and properly appointed. That the Congress has the right, under the Constitution, to refuse to vote anyone's salary of course is not open to question, but I think it is unsound policy for Congress to follow such a procedure as that proposed by the other body. For that reason I shall vote "yea," to insist on the Senate's position.

Mr. BONE. Will the Chair state the motion so we may understand the effect of our votes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFarland in the chair). The question is on the motion of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] that the Senate further insist on its amendment No. 60.

The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll, and Mr. AIKEN voted in the affirmative when his name was called.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I was detained from the Senate floor when the question before the Senate was explained. I should like to ask what evidence was presented to the House with respect to the individuals who are concerned?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, it would take a long time to make an explanation of that matter.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Was there evidence presented to the House Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know whether or not evidence was presented before the House committee. We had the so-called Kerr evidence before the conferees. This motion is merely to uphold the position the Senate has taken, and to send the matter back to conference, and that the Senate insist on its amendment No. 60 striking out the provision in question. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk has begun calling the roll, and I believe one Senator has voted. I hope we can continue with the vote, and that the bill be not retarded.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have no desire to retard the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. I know the Senator has not.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But I did want to know the issue upon which I am asked to vote. I understand the Senator from Tennessee, as the acting chairman of the Appropriations Committee, has moved that the Senate stand by the action it has previously taken, and that the bill be sent back to conference.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is exactly correct.

The legislative clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent from the Senate because of illness. I am advised that if present and voting, these Senators would vote "yea."

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business for the Committee on Military Affairs. I am advised that if present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program. I am advised that if present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are detained in committee meetings. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea."

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is detained on business in one of the Government departments. I am advised that if present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], and the Senators from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE and Mr. TYDINGS] are detained on important public business. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Idaho, the Senator from South Carolina, and the Senators from Maryland would vote "yea."

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent. I am advised that if present and voting he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] are detained on public business.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] are members of the congressional committee attending the funeral of the late Representative Guyer, and are therefore necessarily absent from the city.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] is detained on official business at one of the executive departments.

The result was announced—yeas 69, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—69

Aiken	Gerry	Murdock
Andrews	Gillette	Murray
Austin	Green	Nye
Bailey	Guffey	O'Mahoney
Ball	Gurney	Overton
Bankhead	Hatch	Pepper
Barbour	Hawkes	Reynolds
Bilbo	Hayden	Russell
Bone	Hill	Scruggs
Brewster	Holman	Shipstead
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Buck	La Follette	Taft
Burton	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	Lodge	Tobey
Byrd	Lucas	Tunnell
Capper	McCarran	Vandenberg
Caraway	McClellan	Van Nuys
Chandler	McFarland	Wallgren
Chavez	McKellar	Wheeler
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Wherry
Danaher	Maloney	White
Ellender	Mead	Wiley
Ferguson	Millikin	Willis

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—27

Barkley	Glass	Robertson
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Butler	Kilgore	Thomas, Idaho
Clark, Idaho	Maybank	Thomas, Utah
Connally	Moore	Truman
Davis	O'Daniel	Tydings
Downey	Radcliffe	Wagner
Eastland	Reed	Walsh
George	Revercomb	Wilson

So Mr. McKELLAR's motion that the Senate further insist on its amendment No. 60 was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate further insist on its amendment No. 61, which simply refers to the numbering.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Now, Mr. President, I move that the Senate request a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments still in disagreement,

and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. McKEL-LAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYD-INGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NYE, and Mr. LODGE conferees on the part of the Senate.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BYRD. Is the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

EXTENSION OF COMMODITY CORPORATION—PROPOSED RECOMMITTAL OF BILL

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, out of order, I move that the Senate recommit Senate bill 1108, a bill to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation and to increase its borrowing power, to the Committee on Banking and Currency. I make the motion as the result of an agreement reached this morning in the committee, among the members of the committee, that I should move to have the bill recommitted for further consideration.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I am inclined to favor the motion, if the Senator will specify why he desires to have the bill recommitted.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I made the motion, as I stated, at the request of the members of the committee. No hearings were held by the committee on the principal controversial feature of the bill. After the committee held hearings on the question of continuance of the corporation, the committee went into executive session to act on the bill. An amendment then was proposed on the subject of subsidies and roll-back payments; and, without dealing with the question of holding any further hearings, the committee proceeded by the very small vote of three to two to adopt an amendment to the bill.

After that action was taken, considerable desire was expressed to know more about the bill and to have some hearings held for the information of the members of the committee, at least about the controversial item in the bill. So we have held hearings for 2 days for that purpose; and this morning the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] thought—and other members of the committee including myself agreed with him, all the members of the committee being present—that probably the most helpful procedure would be to have the bill recommitted to the committee for further consideration and further hearings.

That is the reason why the motion is made. That is the only explanation I can make to the Senator.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. As a matter of fact, the purport of the bill, as reported from the committee, is to legalize certain practices as to subsidies which now are being put into effect without any authority of law whatever; are they not?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I should not say that; no. I do not think that statement is correct.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What is the correct statement?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think there is authority of law.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does the Senator think there is any authority of law for the subsidies now being paid by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I rather think there is.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I disagree with the Senator.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is one of the subjects which has been discussed in the committee.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Let me say to the Senator that, either on this bill or on any other bill, when it is reported again, if there is any effort to legalize the practices now being put into effect by Mr. Jones and the R. F. C., there will be a very prolonged and bitter fight on this floor before the bill is ever passed.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not think that is the purpose of the program at all. No one suggested it. The only question which really stands under serious criticism is that of whether the amendment limiting the appropriation goes far enough or whether it should be enlarged. That is the point.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me one further interruption, and then I shall not bother him any further—

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes; I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Let me say that it seems to me there is no question whatever that the matter of subsidies is being proceeded with now in a way entirely unauthorized by law, certainly not contemplated by the act authorizing the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and, in my opinion, in plain violation of law. Any proposition to legalize what is now being done, even by way of limitation, might be construed as a legalization of it. I simply desire to say that I am in favor of the motion of the Senator from Alabama to recommit, but that any renewal of the proposition to legalize the practice now being followed by the R. F. C. will be met with bitter and prolonged opposition on this floor.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Of course, we need not deal with that subject until we reach it. I do not even know that it will be necessary for the Senate to take such action.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the request is made somewhat untimely. I share the view of the Senator from Missouri. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is not in order at this time.

Mr. McNARY. Of course, the motion is not in order until unanimous consent is obtained, and I object.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Very well.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia is a substitute for the committee amendment beginning on page 89, line 15, and going down to page 93, line 4. It does not apply to the Jones-Bankhead farm tenancy program.

Mr. President, I am in hearty accord with the opinions expressed by the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Georgia, that the consideration of the bill should be concluded today. I intend to make my remarks in support of the amendment I have offered as brief and concise as possible, and I shall ask that if there are any questions which any Senator desires to ask me, they be deferred until the conclusion of my initial statement.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to inquire simply about the scope of his substitute?

Mr. BYRD. Very well.

Mr. BONE. Does it cover everything from page 89 to the end of the committee amendment? I simply inquire in order to obtain the correct information.

Mr. BYRD. Down to line 4 on page 93.

Mr. BONE. It does not touch the text of the bill on page 93, under the term "farm tenancy"; does it?

Mr. BYRD. No; it does not. As the Senator will recall, the committee amendment, upon motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], was divided yesterday.

Mr. President, the Farm Security Administration, with which the pending amendment deals, has never been authorized by Congress. It may be called a \$1,000,000,000 bureau of the Government because this is approximately the amount of its expenditures, loans, and grants since its creation.

This is exclusive of the farm tenant program.

Mr. President, I would not deny a single dollar to the small-income farmers, provided that the loans are based upon proper and sound considerations. The amendment proposed by me would utilize other agencies of the Government that are already organized and that are operating successfully to aid the farmers of small incomes at a great saving of administrative cost.

This amendment I will discuss in detail later.

My attention was first attracted to the Farm Security Administration in the investigation of nonessential Federal expenditures by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, of which I have the honor to be chairman. This committee was directed by legislative enactment to make

a full and complete study and investigation of all the expenditures of the Federal Government, with a view to recommending the elimination or reduction of all such expenditures deemed by the committee to be nonessential, and to report at the earliest practicable date to the President and to the Congress the results of its study, together with its recommendations. Last year an exhaustive investigation was made by the joint committee of the exact activities of the Farm Security Administration. I believe the hearings lasted for more than 10 days.

That report was signed without reservation by the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Virginia; the vice chairman, Mr. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, who is chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means; the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations; the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], chairman of the Committee on Finance; the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the ranking Democratic member of the Senate Appropriations Committee; Representative WOODRUM of Virginia, ranking Democratic member of the House Appropriations Committee; THOMAS H. CULLEN, ranking Democratic member of the House Ways and Means Committee; ALLEN T. TREADWAY, ranking Republican member of the House Ways and Means Committee; and JOHN TABER, ranking Republican member of the House Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. President, I wish to emphasize the fact that the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures approves of any sound and proper plan to improve the condition of the low-income farmers; but for reasons which are given, this committee believed—and made a report accordingly—that such activities could be much better administered by the other established bureaus of the Department of Agriculture.

During the period from April 8, 1935, to December 31, 1941, the administrative cost of the Farm Security Administration was \$275,861,889, in order to spend or give away \$714,092,031. In other words, it cost \$1 to loan or give away \$3.

I wish to read to the Senate the breakdown of that administrative cost.

The Farm Security Administration personnel in that period cost the Government, in round figures, \$198,000,000; supplies and materials cost \$30,000,000; rental for equipment, buildings, and land cost \$9,000,000; communications cost \$2,356,000; traveling expenses, including subsistence during that period, cost \$28,769,000; printing and binding cost \$1,844,000; advertising, \$30,000; heat, light, power, water, and electricity, \$759,000; miscellaneous costs were \$2,447,000, making a total of \$275,000,000 in round figures. During that period loans and grants were made to the extent of \$714,000,000.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. The figure \$28,000,000 for traveling expenses, which was cited by the Senator from Virginia, amazes the hearer. Has the Senator any breakdown of that figure?

Mr. BYRD. There is no break-down, except that it was for traveling expenses.

Mr. TOBEY. Was it for travel by motorcar or train, or both? How could it be possible for the agency to spend \$28,000,000 for traveling expenses in one fiscal year?

Mr. BYRD. It is not for one fiscal year. It is for the period April 8, 1935, to December 31, 1941. The traveling expenses for a single year, last year, were \$5,079,804.

Mr. TOBEY. Even that figure hits us in the face. It seems incongruous and an abnormality.

Mr. BYRD. The committee thought it was extremely excessive.

Of course, that includes what is called subsistence, which is part of the traveling expenses—in other words, hotel expenses and meals during the time the employees were traveling.

As of December 31, the Farm Security Administration had 15,960 employees, with an annual pay roll of about \$30,000,000. The traveling expenses for this fiscal year will be \$5,079,804. In addition, \$230,650 was spent for communications—telephone services and telegrams.

This organization maintains 47 State offices, 275 district offices, and 2,315 county offices, making a total of 2,637 offices. It operates these separate and distinct offices side by side with other agencies who are doing more or less similar work.

I now wish to discuss the resettlement projects. I know that they were begun under Mr. Tugwell. They were the Tugwellian experiments, the most costly experiments that have ever been conducted in this country, based upon the Russian form of communism. They were started by Mr. Tugwell, and the same theories which were then advocated by Mr. Tugwell have to a large extent permeated the Farm Security Administration in its other activities.

Those resettlement projects cost originally \$137,502,000. In addition, large sums were spent for development. Of course, I understand that those projects have proved to be so impracticable and so impossible of operation that the Resettlement Administration has abandoned them, but on the other hand, the Administration is attempting to operate a system of cooperative farms which is a program somewhat along the same line.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Can the Senator tell me whether or not a single one of those communal farms has ever been liquidated?

Mr. BYRD. I could not say that definitely, Mr. President. I think that practically none of the resettlement projects has been completely liquidated, except to the extent of being transferred, as I shall explain in a few moments, to some other agency of the Government. So far as I know, the cooperative farms have not been liquidated.

Mr. President, I wish to make some reference to the so-called liquidation of

these projects. Take the Arthurdale homesteads, a pet project of the wife of the President of the United States. Let us see what has happened in that case. The Arthurdale homesteads cost exactly \$2,744,724. They have been partially liquidated, to the extent of \$175,000, but my information is that the Government has secured nearly all the cash it will get out of them. So far as the records which I have been able to obtain are concerned, they show that only \$175,000 has been collected by the Government from this costly experiment which was proposed and sponsored by the wife of the President of the United States.

Let us take some of the other projects to show the method of liquidation which we are told is now going forward. As of June 30, 1942—and that is the latest figure I have been able to obtain—projects with a total capital investment, in round figures—and I shall use round figures to save time—of \$42,000,000 have been sold for \$11,000,000. Some of them have not been wholly sold. Practically none of these projects has been completely liquidated.

Sixty projects of a value of \$65,860,000 have been transferred to the Federal Public Housing Authority. What they call liquidation is actually the transferring of these projects to some other agency of the Government where they will be administered at great cost, and will still add to the deficit which has occurred with respect to these projects.

Let us consider a few of the projects listed here:

In Alabama there are the Gees Bend farms. They cost \$408,264. So far they have been practically liquidated. They have been sold with receipts of about \$128,000.

Take the Skyline farms, in Alabama, on which an investment was made of \$1,260,000—

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. To what year is the Senator referring?

Mr. BYRD. This is a report up to—
Mr. LUCAS. When was the Skyline farms project initiated?

Mr. BYRD. I do not have that date. I imagine that most of these projects were initiated in 1934, 1935, and 1936—at about that period.

Mr. LUCAS. This is the thing we have been hearing about for the last 4 or 5 or 6 years.

Mr. BYRD. The same thing.

Mr. LUCAS. In connection with the early experiments which the Government conducted along that line.

Mr. BYRD. Yes, and they are continuing somewhat the same experiments under a different name, called cooperative farms, which are practically the same as the original resettlement projects. I wish to point out how costly and impractical the experiments have been, and what little value there is left in these projects by reason of the inefficient management which was given to the projects by the Resettlement Administration which was the predecessor of the Farm Security Administration.

In Arkansas—to read just a few of these—consider the Plum Bayou project in which \$1,625,000 was invested. That project has been partially liquidated, only partially, it is true, but the F. S. A. has received \$72,000 for that liquidation.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). Does the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Can the Senator from Virginia tell us what percent of that project has been liquidated?

Mr. BYRD. As to that particular one in Arkansas, only a small percentage of it has been liquidated. They have 180 units, and 17 were liquidated.

I will take another one in the Senator's State, the Lake Dick project. That project cost \$667,599. There has been practically no liquidation as yet. We have the report from the Farm Security Administration that only 26 families are now being housed on that project which cost approximately \$667,000. The Senator is no doubt familiar with that project.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes, I am. In that connection I wish to say that I want to see these projects to which the Senator is directing his remarks absolutely liquidated, and abolished. I think they have been costly and impracticable in my State, and I do not want to support any measure that will continue them.

Mr. BYRD. I imagine the Senator prefers cash liquidation rather than the transfer of these projects to some other agency of the Government, as is being done by the Farm Security Administration.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I will say to the Senator that I do. I think they ought to be completely abolished.

Mr. BYRD. Up to June 30, 1942, \$65,000,000 out of \$135,000,000 of the original cost of these projects was transferred to the Federal Public Housing Authority where the cost will of course continue as far as the Government is concerned. The operating costs of maintenance of these projects as of the date of these figures which I am reading is \$1,877,000 a year, in addition to their original cost.

Take the Roanoke farms. I can furnish any Senator who wants it information concerning the projects of any State. I have an itemized statement which I will ask to have printed in the RECORD. The Roanoke farms, in North Carolina, regarding which there was a publication yesterday in the Washington Post, cost \$2,225,000. Mr. James I. Hicks, investigator for the House committee studying the Farm Security Administration, testified before the committee that the Government could give each of these occupants \$3,500, or give these projects to the occupants, and save to the Treasury one and a quarter million dollars.

That same thing exists, Mr. President, all through these projects.

Here is Oregon, in which \$1,313,000 was expended on a project, which was liquidated to the extent of \$163,000.

Indiana: The Wabash farms represent an investment of \$1,241,000, with

no liquidation as of the date of this report.

South Carolina: The Ashwood plantation, an investment of \$1,919,000, with no liquidation.

Mr. President, I do not want to consume the time of the Senate in reading these figures, but I should like to ask that these data, which have been prepared by the Farm Security Administration, be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit I.)

Mr. BYRD. Now, Mr. President, as far as I can see, there is no provision in this bill providing for a mandatory or immediate liquidation and sale of these projects. It is true that the committee expresses the hope that they will be liquidated, but I think before we pass the pending measure, Mr. President, we should direct the Farm Security Administration not to transfer these projects to other agencies of the Government, but to sell them for what they are worth and take the loss. There is no better time than now and probably there will not be a better time to sell property for many years. Let us get rid of every one of the overhead expenses and administration costs which are constantly piling up the loss which the Government has already suffered in these very costly experiments that were advocated by Mr. Tugwell.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Can the Senator tell us anything about the farms recently bought as a matter of relocating farmers who have been ousted by defense works? It seems to me that in that case we also have farms which are apparently not being sold or liquidated in any way.

Mr. BYRD. I do not have the exact figures, but the Senator is aware that there is such a program.

Mr. TAFT. In 1941 two assistant regional directors of the F. S. A. from Indianapolis, and the State director of the Farm Security Administration at Columbus, Ohio, formed an Ohio corporation called the Ohio Defense Relocation Corporation. They have gone out in Ohio and spent \$1,550,000 to purchase 15,650 acres of land. This is no old proposition. This has been done within 2 years. On that land they have relocated about 156 families, and apparently not one acre of the land has been sold, and no contracts of sale have been made. I may be misinformed, but that is the information that was given me in Columbus. It seems to me an extraordinary project for the Farm Security Administration, in the first place, to form a corporation. I do not know that they have any right to form corporations, although they have done so in all these States, whether to escape audit, or for what purpose, I do not know. Then that corporation goes out and buys 15,000 acres of land, and spends a million dollars and just holds on to it and rents it to people who are relocated from

defense areas. Those are all the facts I know about the situation, but it seems to me it is something which requires an explanation.

Mr. BYRD. Undoubtedly, that is going on in many sections of the country; but the Comptroller General not long ago refused to approve some of the appropriations.

Mr. TAFT. I am told that the purchase of this land was finally stopped because the Comptroller General ruled that the use in that way, at least through the Corporation, was not justified under any law of Congress, and, consequently, the further purchase has been stopped; but, so far as I can see, there is no immediate intention to liquidate at a time when presumably liquidation would be fairly easy.

Mr. BYRD. Not only is there no attempt to liquidate, but, as I understand, the program is continuing.

The Comptroller General found the Farm Security Administration guilty in 1942 of using these funds illegally to buy large tracts of land throughout the United States for the purpose of subdividing them into family units and then reselling them to Farm Security Administration clients, to be resettled in Farm Security Administration colony.

There is another vast resettlement program to which I desire to refer.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I regret that I have not heard the entire discussion of the Senator from Virginia, but I should like to inquire if the Senator has referred to the number of agencies that are now engaged in the loaning of money to the farmers.

Mr. BYRD. I will say that there are 20 agencies engaged directly or indirectly in making loans to farmers.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Twenty such agencies?

Mr. BYRD. Yes; 20 such agencies.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia would consolidate, at least to the extent of the particular agency under consideration, two of those agencies for that purpose, would it not?

Mr. BYRD. In answer to the Senator from West Virginia, it would consolidate two agencies that are already doing such work, the Farm Credit Administration and the Emergency Feed and Crop Loan Administration, which are already making practically the same type of loans that the Farm Security Administration is making.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The result would be that overhead expense in operating those agencies would be curtailed, the farmer would get the same benefit or even greater benefit, and certainly there would be greater efficiency of administration by a consolidation of these agencies.

Mr. BYRD. There is no question about that, for the Farm Security Administration has 15,000 employees, and, as I have stated to the Senate, has 2,300

different offices located throughout the country.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Furthermore, it would mean the dismissal or release from the pay roll of numerous employees of the Government, as a natural result, would it not?

Mr. BYRD. It certainly should and unquestionably would.

In regard to cooperative farming which has been undertaken by the Farm Security Administration in practically every instance that the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Expenditures of which I am chairman has been able to investigate, it has been a colossal failure. It is based on the Russian principle that a group of cooperative farmers should farm a tract of land, each having proportionate ownership. I desire to read to the Senate a statement made by the Appropriations Committee of the House in its report last year:

The Farm Security Administration is also carrying on experiments in collective farming under a plan which appears to resemble the plan of collective farming in communist Russia.

This was the official report made by the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives—

The committee believes that this is wholly contrary to the spirit and genius of the American way of life, and ought to be stopped.

Mr. President, at a regional conference of the F. S. A. officials in Columbus, Ohio, in 1941, and again at another conference in 1942, a circular explaining the F. S. A. program was placed before the conference. The circular was printed at the expense of the Farm Security Administration. Before the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, Mr. Baldwin admitted it was furnished by the F. S. A. officials, and, while he expressed general approval of the objectives, he said he disclaimed any responsibility for the document.

I wish to read to the Senate some of the testimony in respect to that. This document, which has been under consideration by the Farm Security Administration and the ideas of which they have been attempting to sell to the country and to sell to their clients, provides among other things:

For transferring surplus families from overpopulated areas so that the remaining families may be self-supporting.

Creating economic farm units by combining units that are now too small to maintain a family on an acceptable level of living.

Subdividing large holdings which are capable of supporting a large number of farmers on a satisfactory level of living.

Minimum rural housing standards.

Minimum wages for agricultural workers. Homestead exemption laws drawn in such a manner as to protect the family type farm.

In other words, make the family type farm the unit to be exempted. That, of course, would necessitate a change in the State laws and, in many instances, a change in State constitutions, because, in Virginia, for example, and in other States, the revenue of the State or locality comes directly from the taxation of land and tangible personal property.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, in that part of the document just quoted by the Senator referring to dividing up large holdings of lands, whose holdings are referred to?

Mr. BYRD. I am coming to that later. They propose to acquire the holdings by the use of eminent domain and then distribute them, as I understand.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Do they propose to use eminent domain to acquire anybody's property they may select or desire, and then cause it to be divided?

Mr. BYRD. That was the suggestion made in the circular which has been under consideration. I shall come to that in a moment.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to ask whether the Farm Security Administration or any other similar agency of the Government could exercise the right of eminent domain without the consent of the State?

Mr. BYRD. I do not think it could, but I am merely stating what the Farm Security Administration has in mind in this gigantic resettlement project for which it is attempting to create sentiment throughout the country.

Mr. AIKEN. To that extent the States do have control over the situation?

Mr. BYRD. Assuming that the Constitution is as we think it is, and that the Supreme Court will so construe it to be. As I have said, there is to be an exemption from taxation of family-type farms.

The document further proposes—

To exercise the rights of public (eminent) domain as a means of securing the subdivision of large landholdings into family-type farms. To compensate owners of such large holdings on the basis of earning-capacity values.

To expand cooperating farm leasing and purchasing associations as rapidly as experience justifies.

To acquire Government title to such land as is possible.

To retain land now being held by the Government.

That was presented, Mr. President, to the Joint Committee on the Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures. Mr. Baldwin was examined with respect to it. There was no denial of the fact that this document had been printed at Government expense; on the face of it, the document came from the Farm Security Administration, and, while Mr. Baldwin, as I have said—and his testimony is on page 869 and the following pages of the committee report—disclaimed responsibility for it, he did not disclaim his general approval of the objectives of this socialistic and communistic scheme which the Farm Administration has undertaken to sell to the people of this country by reason of meetings and conferences.

I will not take the time of the Senate to discuss it further, but if any Member

of the Senate is interested in it, a full examination of Mr. Baldwin appears in the hearings of the Joint Committee on the Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

A little later a Land Policy Review was issued by the United States Department of Agriculture over the signature of Mr. Paul V. Maris, Director of the Tenant Purchasing Division of the Farm Security Administration. This is practically along the same line, and was discussed at another meeting held at the Hamilton Hotel in Washington, D. C., in January 1942.

This is an amazing document. It provides an agricultural blueprint of what is evidently intended to carry out the aims of Dr. Tugwell, "to make America over," to socialize American agriculture and industry, to regulate all industry and agriculture by one central authority.

To achieve these farm-tenure objectives, the F. S. A. committee report proposed to develop 10,500,000 acres of irrigable land at a total construction cost, including materials and labor, of approximately \$3,000,000,000; 20,000,000 acres of additional drainable land at a total cost, including materials and labor, of approximately \$1,000,000,000; an additional 20,000,000 acres of crop land to be cleared at a total cost, including materials and labor, of \$900,000,000; the construction of over 500,000 new farm-building units on reclaimed land, at a total cost of \$1,500,000; the construction of 1,000,000 new farm-building units in subdivisions and enlarged units at an average cost of \$3,000 a unit, or a total cost of \$3,000,000,000.

Mr. President, that was the program. The United States Government today owns 20 percent of all the land in this country. When we include the public domain and the land which has been acquired or is pending acquisition by the Federal Government alone, including the recent additions which have been acquired by the War Department, the Government at Washington owns 20 percent of all the land in the United States, and day by day the War Department and the Navy Department are increasing tremendously their holdings, during the emergency, without attempting to utilize to the extent they should, in my opinion, the existing land already owned by the United States Government.

The War Department alone, according to a report which the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures will shortly submit to the Congress, has acquired or has pending acquisition in recent months, since the emergency began, nearly 20,000,000 acres of land, I think it is a very dangerous thing to continue to add to the ownership of land under the management and direction of the Federal Government.

I have discussed the resettlement program, and to some extent cooperative farming, and the objectives of this organization; let us not forget that every day the 15,000 agents and employees of the Farm Security Administration are going throughout this country attempting to sell these ideas to the people of

America, doing so by public meetings, and in many other ways.

I wish to call attention to something which occurred last year, when the document which I hold in my hand was printed by the Farm Security Administration and was circulated under frank by this Administration. That was proven beyond any question. The matter circulated was from the New Republic, and is entitled "Who Speaks for the Farmers?"

I mention this because I want the Senate to know that this organization of the Government is using the Government frank and Government money to denounce Senators because they have had the temerity to question anything the Farm Security Administration has done. These are just a few words I wish to quote:

When Senator BYRD called his fellow Virginian, C. B. Baldwin, Federal Security Administrator, before the committee, Mr. Baldwin testified that the Federal Security Administration was approving loans to clients who needed money to pay present or back poll taxes.

Mr. Baldwin is my constituent; he comes from the State of Virginia. I have no quarrel whatever with him, except I think he is the most inefficient and the most irresponsible head of any division of this Government. I have said that to him, and I will repeat it anywhere in the State of Virginia, although he is my constituent and I have had no quarrel whatever with him of a political character. His family has always supported me in my political career, beginning with the time when I was a candidate for Governor. This is what the document says:

The Byrd committee's all-star cast of Senators from poll-tax States were horrified by such brazen belief in constitutional guarantees, and CARTER GLASS was quick to assert that if the Department of Agriculture Solicitor agreed that such procedure was legal, Mr. Baldwin had better get himself a new solicitor.

As a matter of fact, it is against the constitutions of these Southern States to advance money to anyone to pay his poll tax; it is specifically and definitely prohibited by the constitutions of these States. Then it is said:

Senators McKellar, of Tennessee, and GEORGE, of Georgia, made equally determined noises to indicate that tenants and croppers are not going to be forced to own their own farms, paint their houses, or feed their children balanced diets so long as they are in the Senate to ward off such a fate.

There are two pages of like denunciations of Senators, distributed under the franking privilege of the United States Government, and at the cost of the Government.

Mr. President, that is the type of organization the Farm Security Administration is.

I do not wish to take more of the time of the Senate than necessary. I now come to the rehabilitation program of the Farm Security Administration. Mr. Baldwin testified before the Senate Agricultural Committee that his agency had loaned in rehabilitation loans approximately \$560,000,000. No one can foresee

or estimate the ultimate loss to the Government by reason of these loans because of the methods by which this organization conducts its affairs.

Mr. Baldwin testified before the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures about a year ago that he estimated a loss of 20 percent, which would be \$110,000,000 on the total loans of \$550,000,000. Yet the assertion has been made that the clients of the Farm Security Administration are current and that they have paid their loans as they become due, in the main.

The fact is, and Mr. Baldwin has admitted it, that he makes additional loans to these clients. He makes loans when the clients are unable, as they are in many instances, to pay the installments which are due. He makes additional loans, and he furthermore has the right to make grants, to which I have not yet referred.

I wish to call attention to pages 1659 and 1660 of the House hearings on the 1944 bill. In response to an inquiry from Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. Baldwin said:

The rule we follow on that is this: If the borrower is going to continue on the program but has not met all of his installments—most of them have met most of their installments throughout the country—we take a new note.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The new note makes him current; does it not?

Mr. BALDWIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. DIRKSEN, at this meeting of the committee, said:

Every time there is a maturity that has not been paid, for a given annual installment, you make a new note?

Mr. BALDWIN. Not in each instance * * *. The rule we follow on that is this: If the borrower is going to continue on the program * * * we take a new note.

Then Mr. DIRKSEN said:

The new note makes him current?

And Mr. Baldwin replied:

Yes, sir; it does.

In addition to taking a new note in order to make them current when they have obligations which have not been paid, he continues to make additional loans, time and time again, to his clients.

I have some data here from Alabama. A man named Sandy Garrett who lives at Childersburg, Ala., received \$202.65 in grants. That is one of the ways many of these loans are made current. Mr. Baldwin makes grants, as well as loans. Mr. Garrett repaid only \$27.79 of his indebtedness, and was then given a new loan of \$274.

Mr. Ed Lewis of Hale County, Alabama, borrowed \$2,406 but repaid only \$163, and during this period he received grants totaling \$380—more than twice the amount of his total payments.

Britt Wages received 18 loans totaling \$2,224.

J. M. White received 18 loans totaling \$2,628, and then paid back only \$511.

I will not read more of these cases, because any amount of such data is available.

Mr. President, one of the objections, as I see it, to the Farm Security Administration, is that it puts farmers into debt

to the extent that they cannot pay the debt. I wish to read from the record of the hearings the basis on which many of these loans are made. They are made, Mr. President, for the purpose, and it was so admitted by Mr. Baldwin, of attending moving pictures. The Farm Security Administration regards that as a standard of living. Loans could be made for the purpose of joining the Knights of Pythias or the Masons. What I now say is based on evidence in response to questions which were asked Mr. Baldwin by the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar]. I shall have that part of the record looked up, and shall read it to the Senate later.

Mr. President, the amendment proposed by me provides that these activities shall be transferred to the Farm Credit Administration and the Emergency Crop and Feed Loan Section.

The Emergency Crop and Feed Loan Section is now making loans to more than 1,000,000 low-income farmers. It has done a magnificent work. I think all Senators present will agree with that statement. In fact it has made 1,491,655 loans, including 167,405 drought loans. This organization has personnel in every part of the United States, in every county. My amendment provides that the Extension Service shall be utilized; that the farm agents shall be utilized. We have a farm agent in every county, as Senators know, and if this proposal were adopted it would greatly simplify and coordinate the work which is now being performed by the Farm Security Administration.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. Has the Senator from Virginia figures to show what percentage of feed loans have been paid back?

Mr. BYRD. The feed loans have been operated extremely efficiently, I will say to the Senator from South Carolina. The cost of servicing each loan of the Emergency Crop and Feed Loan Section is \$2.54, whereas the cost to the Farm Security Administration for servicing each loan is \$46.07.

Mr. SMITH. The reason I asked the question is that there has been a difference between the collections made in certain regions. In the South and the Southwest I am informed about 97 percent of the loans have been repaid.

Mr. BYRD. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH. Under certain weather conditions in the West, by reason of which the farmers do not have the wherewithal to repay the loans, they have not repaid them.

Mr. BYRD. My information is that the average of repayment has been very high. Of course, drought loans are likewise made by the Emergency Crop and Feed Loan Section.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Has the Senator from Virginia figures showing what percentage of subsistence loans have been repaid by farmers?

Mr. BYRD. Does the Senator mean rehabilitation loans?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I do not think the repayment statistics amount to anything at all because, as I have just explained, Mr. Baldwin testified that when the loans become in arrears they simply gave new notes.

Mr. EASTLAND. I understood from Mr. Baldwin's testimony that only 25 percent of the rehabilitation loans had been repaid in full.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Baldwin admitted to the committee that there was a loss of 20 percent on the original loans.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. Baldwin was before a subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry a short time ago. The Senator from Virginia stated, I believe, that 80 percent of the Farm Security loans have been repaid. I presume that is 80 percent of the amount due.

Mr. BYRD. No; what I said was that Mr. Baldwin testified that his loss would be 20 percent. I think his loss is going to be very much greater.

Mr. AIKEN. Those figures are over a year old, are they not?

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. It is a fact that these small farmers are a little better off during the past year, because they have gotten better prices, and that many of them have gone to work in machine shops and received more money.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Baldwin testified that there would be a loss of 20 percent on the original loan.

Mr. AIKEN. At the present time, between 82 and 85 percent of the loans which have become due have been paid back, and it is estimated that the amount paid back will be nearly 90 percent. So that the loss will not be nearly so great as was anticipated a year ago.

Mr. BYRD. Yes; but I do not agree with the Senator from Vermont with respect to the fact that the loans are current, because Mr. Baldwin testified that when the loans become in default he frequently accepted new notes, and then regarded those loans as being current. That is shown in his testimony.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; but do not some of our big businessmen and big corporations do the same thing? Why should we criticize the little fellow with the \$200 loan?

Mr. BYRD. I am not criticizing that. My criticism is based on the fact that Mr. Baldwin said that his loans are current; when a loan becomes in arrears, and a new note is taken for it, it does not thereby become current. That is not the proper way to do it.

Mr. AIKEN. If it is proper for the big businessman or corporation to follow such a practice, is it not proper for the F. S. A. to do so?

Mr. BYRD. What I am speaking of is whether such a loan is current or not. Mr. Baldwin testified that he simply gives a new note when a loan becomes in arrears, and then calls that loan current.

Mr. AIKEN. Does not the Reconstruction Finance Corporation do that in connection with its operations?

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Vermont perhaps knows more about that than I do. I spoke of what Mr. Baldwin said. Let me read to the Senate the testimony of Mr. Baldwin with respect to the basis upon which he makes these loans. It has already been called to the Senate's attention that he makes loans with which to pay poll taxes, but it is further testified that he has made no loans to Negroes to pay poll taxes in the South. Why that was, I do not know. He made them to the white people only.

I now read from the hearings before the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures:

Senator McKellar. Do you include movie tickets, tickets to the movies, for proper recreation?

Mr. Baldwin. No, sir. This is a miscellaneous column there that might include such an item. I think these people are privileged to go to the movies; yes.

Senator McKellar. So you would include the movies. Would you include the travel expenses to town, for a chance of recreation in the city nearby?

Mr. Baldwin. Well, I think, sir, the rule of reason would be followed. These families are poor families. They have the same likes and dislikes, I guess, as most of us have.

Senator McKellar. Would you include the Knights of Pythias dues, and Masonic dues, and chamber of commerce dues, and things like that?

Mr. Baldwin. These items are the normal cost that go toward living in a democracy.

Senator McKellar. That would be normally included under the new democracy?

That is the basis for my statement, Mr. President, that many of these loans have been made on that ground. I am not going to take up more of the time of the Senate. I think we must face fairly and squarely the situation, Senators, that there should be a reduction of these bureaus of the Government which are duplicating work of other bureaus of the Government. We have 20 different agencies making agricultural loans of one kind or another. I know of no better place to start to coordinate and consolidate the activities of the Government than in these agencies which are making loans to the farmers, and I know of no better place to start than to adopt the amendment which has been offered by me, which is the same amendment as was proposed by the House Appropriations Committee, the same amendment which was proposed in the House after very careful consideration and stricken out there on a point of order. I know of no better way to start than for the Senate to adopt the amendment and consolidate the activities of the Farm Security Administration with the Farm Credit Administration and the facilities which are already established in the Emergency Crop and Feed Loan Section.

Mr. President, I shall conclude with one further statement. In the course of the debate we have heard a great deal of criticism of the American Farm Bureau Federation. I am not one who has by any means blindly agreed with opinions and followed the recommendations of the American Farm Bureau Federation. On the contrary, I think I have

voted against their recommendations perhaps more frequently than I have voted for them. However, let me here and now pay my tribute to that great organization of farmers for having performed and for performing now one of the best jobs which has been done or is being done for the farmers of America. When it is said that the American Farm Bureau Federation does not represent the small-income farmers of the country I want to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the magazine *Fortune* conducted a survey not long ago, and as a result found that 60 percent of all organized farmers are members of the American Farm Bureau Federation. It is the largest farm organization in America today. The survey showed that 60 percent of the high-income farmers are members of the American Farm Bureau Federation, that 61 percent of the medium-income farmers are members of the Federation, and that 48 percent of the low-income farmers who are organized are members of it. The federation advocates the amendment which was proposed by the House Appropriations Committee and which has been offered by the Senator from Virginia. I offer no apologies whatever for offering to the Senate this amendment, which comes from the greatest farm organization in this country, an organization which represents in its membership more low-income agricultural producers than does any other farm organization in existence. I believe that Mr. O'Neal and the other men who have charge of that great farm organization are now looking at the question from the standpoint of what is best for the farmers and what will be best for them after the conclusion of the war, when, in my judgment, the farmers will be faced with the most serious conditions, after Europe has caught up with its food supplies, ever to be confronted by them. The American Farm Bureau Federation is now attempting to simplify all the various agencies dealing with farmers, so that the farmer will not become a servant of the bureaus in Washington, and so that the farmer's every action will not be controlled by the various Washington bureaus. The American Farm Bureau Federation is rendering the farmers a valuable service, in endeavoring to bring about a coordination and consolidation of the various governmental bureaus in the interests of the farmers of America.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. Let me ask the Senator if he proposes to change the manner in which the feed loan is to be operated?

Mr. BYRD. I think the bill which has been offered by the Senator from South Carolina, to increase the maximum from \$400 to \$800, as I understand, should by all means be passed, especially if this amendment is agreed to; and, if necessary, the amount should be increased above \$800. I am thoroughly in accord with the Senator's bill, which I understand is now pending in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and I hope the Senate will pass it.

Mr. SMITH. I simply want to know if the amendment proposes a change in the method of handling the feed loans.

Mr. BYRD. It was not intended to change it.

Mr. SMITH. The language is:

To enable the Secretary, through the Farm Credit Administration and through existing agencies under its supervision.

The feed loan activities come under the supervision of the Farm Credit Administration.

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. SMITH. So there will be no change; is that correct?

Mr. BYRD. No change. There was no intention to make any change, and I am certain the amendment does not do so.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. As I understood the Senator's remarks with reference to the liquidation of the projects which have been discussed, he stated that in the committee amendment to the bill he felt there was not sufficient or adequate direction to compel their liquidation.

Mr. BYRD. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. As I read the committee amendment and also the last paragraph of the amendment which the Senator is now offering, it seems to me they are practically the same. Practically the same language is used.

Mr. BYRD. I am glad the Senator reminded me. I have an amendment as follows:

On page 95, line 11, insert the following: "Provided further, That no part of the appropriation authorized under this item shall be used except for the complete liquidation of the Resettlement projects which shall be accomplished by December 31, 1943."

That amendment would go in on page 95, where appropriation of \$421,039 is made to carry out the liquidation and management of resettlement projects. I offer that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will lie on the table, and be printed.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator is offering an amendment which will place a limit on the time during which the projects must be liquidated; is that correct?

Mr. BYRD. I think the Senator is correct in his statement. Certainly, the pending amendment of the Senator from Virginia does not cover that matter, and I do not think the committee amendment adequately covers it.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Am I to understand that the amendment of the Senator from Virginia is a substitute for the committee amendment which was agreed to yesterday?

Mr. BYRD. The committee amendment was not agreed to yesterday, let me say to the Senator. My amendment is a substitute for that part of the committee amendment beginning on page 89, line 15, and extending down to and including line 4 on page 93.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Will the Senator advise me whether the sum total of appropriations included in his substitute

amendment is less or more than the total included in the amendment for which his is proposed as a substitute?

Mr. BYRD. I will say it is substantially less. The amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia provides for administrative expenses of \$12,000,000, of which \$8,000,000 shall be available to the extension services of the land-grant colleges, and so forth. Let me explain to the Senator the reason why the amount is reduced so substantially. Because the committee amendment provides for the same expenses of \$29,607,573; the Senator from Virginia feels that if the other organizations are utilized there can be a saving in administrative expenses to that extent; and then the loans are reduced from \$97,500,000 to \$40,000,000.

Mr. O'DANIEL. The amount which might be available for the farmers has also been reduced by the Senator's amendment; is that correct?

Mr. BYRD. It has been reduced. Let me say to the Senator that there are a number of new agencies making loans to the farmers. One of them is the R. A. C. C., which recently was organized. It makes nonrecourse loans of approximately \$300,000,000 or \$400,000,000.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, next week a bill to abolish that agency will be pending.

Mr. BYRD. It is not abolished in the pending bill.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Then, Mr. President, if the amendment of the Senator from Virginia is agreed to, it will mean that, while the functions are transferred to another division of the Government, yet the amount available to the farmers for the purposes enumerated will be reduced by more than \$40,000,000; is that correct?

Mr. BYRD. The amount for loans is proposed to be reduced from \$97,500,000 to \$40,000,000. The latter is the amount which the House Appropriations Committee, after long hearings and careful consideration, regarded as adequate. I think everyone will recognize that the administrative expenses can and should be reduced, if the proposed consolidation with existing agencies is made.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, let me inquire of the Senator if, in his opinion, the other agencies of government to which his amendment would transfer the present functions of the Farm Security Administration are now sufficiently staffed, organized, and prepared so as to be able to carry on those functions. In other words, I should not want to have the functions of the Farm Security Administration and that part of the program having to do with the making of loans to small-income farmers abolished. I want to have it retained; and at this time I should not want to have made a transfer which might jeopardize that program.

Mr. BYRD. I will say to the Senator that the \$12,000,000 appropriation for which provision is made, plus the funds those agencies already have, in my judgment will be adequate; because, as the Senator knows, the extension services and the emergency crop-and-feed loan agency now have organizations existing

all over the country, and it is proposed to use them.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Are they prepared and equipped to give comparatively the same quality of service in the way of guidance and instruction to small farmers?

Mr. BYRD. I think they are. In 1942 the Emergency Crop and Feed Loan organization made loans to more than 1,400,000 farmers which is nearly twice the amount of loans made by the Farm Security Administration. The Senator is familiar with the farm agents' organization. It is being utilized.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In this connection, I do not feel that we ought completely to liquidate this program at this time, when food is so vital. I refer to the program for aiding and servicing the small income farmer. With respect to these projects, I think every one ought to be abolished. That is the way I wish to vote on the question, if it is presented in that form.

Mr. BYRD. In response to the Senator's question, let me say that the Emergency Crop and Feed Loan organization is servicing many more loans for the smaller farmer than is this organization. The total number of loans in 1942 was 1,491,000.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Are those the seed and feed loans?

Mr. BYRD. It is the Emergency Crop and Feed Loan Section. It has an organization which can be expanded by the additional appropriation of \$12,000,000, which would be adequate, in my judgment, to take care of the program.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Under the Senator's amendment would the other agency have the same authority as the F. S. A. has under existing law to carry on the work of the F. S. A. with regard to the servicing of the low-income farmers?

Mr. BYRD. It would have authority to make loans in the rural rehabilitation program.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Referring to grants, if the functions of this agency were transferred, as the Senator's amendment provides, would the new agency with which it would be consolidated have authority to make grants to farmers, we will say, in areas which have suffered tremendous damage from the disastrous floods which have recently occurred?

Mr. BYRD. I do not think it would have authority to make grants. It would have authority to make loans. It now makes drought loans, which are in the same class.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Would the Senator's amendment provide for making grants as well as loans?

Mr. BYRD. The language of the amendment is:

Making and servicing loans: To enable the Secretary, through the Farm Credit Administration and through existing agencies under its supervision, including the Crop and Feed Loan Division and Production Credit Associations, to administer all activities, projects, facilities, and functions heretofore carried on under the caption "Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation," the continuance of which is authorized under the terms of this appropriation, and to provide assistance to

needy farmers in the United States, its Territories and possessions, unable to obtain credit elsewhere.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Then, according to the Senator's interpretation of the amendment, it would authorize grants to farmers in flooded areas.

Mr. BYRD. I do not think it would. The limitation is as follows:

None of the moneys appropriated or otherwise authorized under this caption ("Loans and rural rehabilitation") shall be used for (1) the purchase of land or for the carrying on of any land-purchase program; (2) for carrying on any experiment in collective farming, except for the liquidation of any such projects heretofore initiated; or (3) for making loans to any individual farmer in excess of \$2,500.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wished to determine whether or not the other agency could make grants in flooded areas to rehabilitate farmers, as well as making loans to them.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I tried to refrain from interrupting the Senator. He asked not to be interrupted; but I must say that when this amendment was proposed in the House, it was not contended that there was any authority for making grants. As a matter of fact, it was insisted that that authority be abolished. If the Senator will read the language, he will find that it refers only to rural re-

habilitation loans. There is no authority for making grants, no matter how grave the emergency may be.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Is the Senator referring to the committee amendment?

Mr. RUSSELL. No. The committee amendment permits grants.

Mr. McCLELLAN. What I am trying to determine is the difference between the authority under the committee amendment and the authority under the amendment proposed by the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. RUSSELL. There can be no question about it. On page 7, in the committee amendment, there is specific authority, which has always been carried, for making grants in case of disaster. That is found under subdivision (3).

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is the way I interpreted the committee amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Those grants are made from the \$29,000,000 to which the Senator from Virginia refers as administrative expenses; but under the Senator's amendment there would be available only \$4,000,000 for handling the \$450,000,000 in loans which are outstanding, as well as for making new loans of \$40,000,000. The other \$8,000,000 would go to the Extension Service. There is no fund in the amendment of the Senator from Virginia which could possibly be used for grants.

Mr. BYRD. What I tried to make clear to the Senator is that the amend-

ment does not provide for making grants, but it does provide for rural rehabilitation loans to needy farmers. That provision is found on page 2 of my amendment, beginning in line 13.

My amendment would enable the Secretary—

to administer all activities, projects, facilities, and functions heretofore carried on under the caption, "Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation," the continuance of which is authorized under the terms of this appropriation.

With respect to what the Senator from Georgia has just said as to the administrative cost, it is intended to utilize existing machinery of other agencies, which would not necessitate anything like the administrative cost of the 15,000 employees now carried by the Farm Security Administration.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I merely wished to get the matter clear in my own mind. Ordinarily I would not favor the grant provision in the law as it has existed in the past; but in my State and in many others an emergency exists, which has been brought about by the recent floods. I think it is necessary that some provision be made for grants to farmers in order to rehabilitate them and put them back on a self-sustaining basis.

Mr. BYRD. That could be easily done by emergency legislation. The amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia is permanent legislation.

EXHIBIT I

United States Department of Agriculture, Farm Security Administration, status of projects as of June 30, 1942

RECAPITULATION BY TYPE

Description	Total capital investment	Developed units			Units sold			Income, fiscal year 1942	Operating obligations, fiscal year 1942				Management obligations, fiscal year 1942
		Number of units	Total cost	Average cost	Number of units	Total sales price	Average sales price		Operations and maintenance	Taxes	Insurance	Total	
Projects sold or partially sold	\$42,927,423.35	5,982	\$34,482,431.58	\$5,764.36	3,099	\$11,904,862.76	\$4,389.70	\$670,312.67	\$255,579.79	\$185,129.07	\$79,278.71	\$19,987.57	5354,271.75
Projects on which no units have been sold	27,618,406.57	3,154	21,096,146.43	6,688.69				392,857.28	173,665.61	84,065.08	37,644.18	295,374.87	203,966.44
Projects undeveloped	1,148,611.64	74				47,100.00		32,413.85	10,132.23	5,222.52	533.83	15,888.08	6,445.91
Projects transferred to Federal Public Housing Authority	65,808,271.69	5,483	41,940,861.09	7,649.25	1,427	3,332,240.94	2,335.13	1,552,664.74	707,897.09	309,914.36	28,193.90	1,046,005.35	205,077.09
Total	137,502,713.25	14,693	97,519,439.10	6,637.14	4,526	15,284,203.70	3,692.72	2,648,248.54	1,147,274.82	584,331.03	145,050.62	1,877,256.47	769,761.19

PROJECTS SOLD OR PARTIALLY SOLD

State and project name	Total capital investment	Developed units			Units sold			Income, fiscal year 1942	Operating obligations, fiscal year 1942				Management obligations, fiscal year 1942
		Number of units	Total cost	Average cost	Number of units	Total sales price	Average sales price		Operations and maintenance	Taxes	Insurance	Total	
Alabama:													
Gee's Bend farms	\$408,264.50	101	\$303,578.87	\$3,005.73	95	\$128,250.00	\$1,350.00	\$6,001.39	\$444.10			\$444.10	\$7,517.83
Prairie farms	200,935.89	36	140,315.15	3,897.64	34	115,532.00	3,398.00	2,379.44	1,062.73		\$46.00	1,108.73	6,247.97
Skyline farms	1,200,030.87	156	863,597.05	5,535.88	32	96,000.00	3,000.00	4,854.36	10,859.01			10,859.01	8,465.02
Arkansas:													
Arkansas Farm Tenant Security	513,297.56	66	393,289.43	5,958.93	16	78,564.00	4,910.25	10,985.49	2,966.15	\$317.62		3,283.77	4,304.48
Biscoe farms	371,935.47	74	334,409.51	4,519.03	69	296,382.00	4,295.39	8,345.06	835.67	33.77		869.44	6,783.25
Central and western Arkansas Valley farms	359,390.35	82	359,390.35	4,382.81	69	248,306.21	3,598.64	6,805.78	2,646.45	74.86	3,146.72	5,868.03	6,875.67
Chicot farms	1,050,864.80	89	514,130.29	5,776.74	30	92,722.07	3,090.74	1,272.30	215.11	5,884.42	62.89	6,162.42	10,820.98
Clover Bend farms	478,670.86	86	374,978.42	4,360.21	76	320,415.00	4,215.99	10,458.07	2,496.35	88.27	247.55	2,832.17	7,827.71
Deshia	499,489.59	88	466,807.97	5,304.64	60	275,278.10	4,587.97	10,985.72	1,343.01	845.66		2,188.67	7,576.64
Lake Dick	667,594.36	89	297,566.47	3,343.44	8	36,550.00	4,568.75	19,632.92	3,499.82	420.04	4,178.00	8,097.86	7,050.40
Lakeview	602,742.57	140	679,287.49	4,852.05	52	212,770.00	4,091.73	24,257.84	7,049.87	471.87		7,521.74	9,334.33
Lonoke farms	249,873.37	41	191,866.68	4,679.43	39	184,474.64	4,730.12	5,455.21	775.16	60.79	1,099.44	2,905.39	5,230.99
Northwest Arkansas farms	214,320.60	44	214,320.60	4,877.88	30	124,550.40	4,151.68	3,620.44	2,923.18	77.17	1,717.96	4,718.31	6,765.61
Plum Bayou	1,629,716.77	180	1,172,266.60	6,512.59	17	72,255.00	4,250.29	26,270.46	8,191.68	1,251.01		9,442.69	14,560.37

United States Department of Agriculture, Farm Security Administration, status of projects as of June 30, 1942—Continued

PROJECTS SOLD OR PARTIALLY SOLD—continued

State and project name	Total capital investment	Developed units			Units sold			Income, fiscal year 1942	Operating obligations, fiscal year 1942				Management obligations, fiscal year 1942
		Number of units	Total cost	Average cost	Number of units	Total sales price	Average sales price		Operations and maintenance	Taxes	Insurance	Total	
California: Mendocino resettlement project	\$25,175.00	4	\$11,750.00	\$2,937.50	4	\$11,599.00	\$2,899.90						\$21.50
Colorado:													
San Luis Valley farms	1,075,723.29	86	633,149.09	7,362.20	50	348,572.00	6,971.44	\$4,611.03	\$15,913.00	\$2,225.00	\$50.30	\$18,188.30	7,995.04
Western slope farms	1,146,877.01	103	982,153.19	9,535.47	31	220,585.66	7,115.67	17,349.07	8,849.33	15,894.00	4,014.37	23,757.70	8,251.82
Florida: Escambia	563,253.75	81	389,882.72	4,800.45	21	73,500.00	3,500.00	2,303.65	4,688.75			4,688.75	7,806.02
Georgia:													
Flint River farms	731,736.08	146	519,928.00	3,561.15	63	225,057.00	3,572.33	6,586.00	66.00			66.00	8,412.32
Georgia Farm Tenant Security	674,610.87	106	648,912.78	6,121.82	27	117,324.00	4,345.33	7,286.92	1,977.36		4,373.20	6,350.56	200.00
Idaho:													
Boundary farms	788,440.97	37	469,005.19	12,675.82	37	332,304.00	8,981.19	9,219.18			11.74	11.74	4,609.57
Idaho scattered farms	195,924.49	87	149,537.55	1,718.82	62	96,829.27	1,561.76	5,587.95		1,108.35	285.56	1,393.91	76.27
Kansas: Northeastern Kansas farms	243,382.55	26	224,728.24	8,643.39	8	81,576.00	10,197.00	1,145.96	2,976.54	2,387.42	1,653.04	7,017.00	3,342.70
Kentucky:													
Sublimity farms	441,386.14	66	350,928.66	5,317.10	(1)	(1)	(1)	4,608.82	2,824.00			2,824.00	
Christian-Trigg farms	971,429.33	103	877,098.17	8,515.52	41	306,492.79	7,475.43	22,803.88	4,897.39	4,000.32	6,660.38	15,558.09	8,717.94
Louisiana:													
Louisiana Farm Tenant Security	622,284.51	110	555,903.95	5,053.67	39	177,319.00	4,546.64	13,094.03	6,345.40	2,807.87	3,842.32	12,995.59	5,503.40
Mounds farms	867,723.12	145	525,090.46	3,621.31	2	12,181.00	6,090.50	10,354.30	365.17	6,035.99		6,401.16	
Transylvania farms	873,404.11	100	699,801.07	4,373.76	16	78,870.00	4,929.38	1,358.43	121.60	5,368.98	1,631.00	7,121.58	9,703.16
Maine: State of Maine farms	380,664.46	66	380,664.46	5,767.64	38	133,179.18	3,504.71	6,910.29	7,583.00		1,636.34	9,219.34	3,885.11
Michigan:													
Corporation farms and real estate	46,595.12	18	46,595.12	2,588.62	13	16,343.83	1,257.22	5,051.01					
Johannesburg farms	84,743.21	15	84,743.21	5,649.55	15	74,011.75	4,934.12						
Southern Michigan farms	554,593.31	72	554,593.31	7,702.68	27	169,662.00	6,283.78	10,462.72	5,251.28			5,251.28	
Minnesota:													
Albert Lea homesteads	46,315.25	14	46,315.25	3,308.23	14	30,257.71	2,161.27	2,452.09			665.20	665.20	
Central Minnesota farms	1,033,846.66	105	1,033,846.66	9,846.16	99	921,045.28	9,303.49	29,148.47	3,938.70		31.96	3,970.66	5,271.24
Ethan Allen	13,700.00	4	8,025.00	2,006.25	3	9,681.00	3,193.66						
Beltrami Island farms	493,654.41	214	493,654.41	2,306.80	214	480,278.84	2,244.29						
Minnesota scattered farms	3,978.00	3	3,978.00	1,326.00	3	3,603.68	1,201.23						
Mississippi:													
Hinds farms	271,289.91	73	249,151.42	3,413.03	59	199,693.00	3,384.63	5,900.45	1,141.76	985.00	2,405.92	4,532.68	7,845.66
Lucedale farms	460,740.04	93	407,525.25	4,381.99	64	162,000.00	2,531.25	7,204.72	683.62	1,450.00	3,463.52	5,597.14	6,382.54
Mississippi Farm Tenant Security	1,822,040.57	294	1,340,203.80	4,558.52	135	685,640.00	5,078.81	43,486.02	4,071.88	15,717.00	121.14	19,910.02	9,919.42
Northeast Mississippi farms	552,363.34	112	545,484.00	4,870.39	45	144,327.19	3,207.27	10,263.92	2,766.47	2,160.00	25.00	4,951.47	8,450.24
Missouri: Rehabilitation demonstration farms	149,163.72	51	149,163.72	2,924.78	4	3,589.00	897.25	12,559.73	648.99		57.62	706.61	
Montana:													
Fairfield Bench farms	1,159,571.51	129	1,096,191.88	8,497.61	89	348,572.00	3,916.54	13,160.21	10,472.00	15,750.00	8,781.57	35,003.57	7,854.62
Milk River farms	2,034,071.38	163	1,341,217.41	8,228.33	64	220,585.66	3,446.63	30,578.72	12,250.27	33,307.46	2.68	45,560.41	7,503.54
New York:													
Finger Lakes farms	433,515.32	55	433,515.32	7,882.10	35	189,335.14	5,409.58	10,782.01	8,263.00	1,473.00	5,185.25	14,921.25	4,312.18
New York Valley farms	273,012.30	34	273,012.30	8,029.77	22	121,812.57	5,536.94	7,696.40	2,233.83	1,137.68	3,551.75	6,923.26	2,076.36
North Carolina:													
North Carolina Farm Tenant Security	553,933.71	95	539,891.27	5,683.07	40	184,362.90	4,609.07	8,805.65	1,474.85	3,808.69	108.44	5,391.98	4,960.11
Pembroke farms	623,473.60	65	417,851.77	6,428.49	58	290,059.00	5,001.02	7,208.91	1,586.26	3,780.61	78.09	5,444.96	6,544.01
Roanoke farms	2,225,364.77	294	1,743,104.62	5,928.93	44	188,922.32	4,293.69	28,293.89	6,948.68	4,320.48	136.15	11,405.31	9,460.34
Scuppernon farms	796,016.04	49	392,966.64	8,019.72	20	118,190.00	5,909.50	5,614.96	8,949.59	4,739.73		13,680.32	9,020.75
Wolf Pit farms	274,493.51	37	202,738.41	5,479.42	29	131,280.00	4,526.90	1,685.27	152.75	1,240.60	4.77	1,398.18	2,913.29
North Dakota:													
Burlington project	212,867.31	35	143,361.27	4,066.04	1	5,050.00	5,050.00	859.29	2,633.80	308.31		2,962.11	3,797.58
Red River Valley farms	1,408,708.89	140	1,086,923.88	7,763.87	8	69,840.00	8,730.00	2,939.73	6,629.56	11,195.77	1.60	17,826.93	6,349.86
Oklahoma:													
Eastern Oklahoma farms	653,218.92	71	523,409.62	7,371.79	59	378,574.20	6,416.51	2,415.60	6,214.86	3,297.04	54.24	9,566.14	6,102.47
Oklahoma Farm Tenant Security	558,942.48	85	482,311.08	10,162.59	9	65,554.59	7,283.84	16,409.46	4,767.04	2,043.33	229.90	7,040.27	562.46
Oregon: Yamhill farms	1,313,533.81	104	1,256,682.72	12,083.58	22	163,218.00	7,419.00	21,964.03	12,347.94	3,033.05	6,568.19	21,919.18	6,919.95
Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania farms	261,391.06	37	244,032.04	6,596.00	20	105,439.28	5,271.96	7,064.12	10,546.00	1,375.98	347.84	12,269.82	4,514.04
South Carolina:													
Allendale farms	600,253.20	117	554,929.51	4,742.99	1	12,000.00	12,000.00	12,449.71	4,510.45	2,344.00	2,248.00	9,102.45	7,961.98
Orangeburg farms	534,047.76	80	458,493.29	5,731.17	37	158,881.00	4,294.08	4,903.39	497.27	2,222.00	873.73	3,593.00	8,645.34
South Dakota: Eastern South Dakota farms	420,132.59	39	420,132.59	10,772.63	4	41,350.00	10,337.50	3,871.84	4,435.00	4,091.91		8,526.91	3,281.50
Tennessee: Tennessee Farm Tenant Security	903,982.93	137	739,646.74	5,398.88	52	230,198.15	4,426.89	14,837.38	4,107.89	5,014.00	7,063.80	16,187.69	7,627.70
Texas:													
Sabine farms	419,361.61	80	349,542.67	4,369.28	61	218,293.83	3,578.58	2,914.15	3,346.52			3,346.52	6,120.90
Sam Houston farms	614,061.83	86	504,406.17	5,865.19	17	94,755.47	5,573.83	6,025.34	7,185.01	2,859.27		10,044.28	6,753.73
Texas Farm Tenant Security	989,826.36	111	972,349.51	8,759.60	34	197,924.00	5,821.29	24,328.69	5,654.81	2,527.53	639.17	8,821.51	3,964.60
Utah:													
Sevier Valley farms	161,007.18	18	160,113.48	8,893.19	18	125,375.84	6,965.32	662.26		221.00		221.00	30.00
Widtsoe resettlement project	87,894.00	15	69,000.41	4,600.03	11	57,458.99	5,223.54	1,045.37			70.16	70.16	
Virgin Islands:													
St. Croix homesteads					337								
St. Thomas homesteads					50								
Washington:													
Snohomish farms	497,070.08	44	497,070.08	11,297.03	41	368,048.00	8,976.78	8,503.68	4,608.86		582.34	191.20	5,450.37
Washington scattered farms	285,405.88	129	234,979.16	1,821.54	97	139,919.23	1,442.47	1,326.90	222.99	351.67	438.38	1,013.04	76.14
Wisconsin:													
Central Wisconsin farms	544,899.34	73	532,299.68	7,291.77	34	187,351.50	5,510.34	22,232.53	10,111.03	5,020.49	13.43	15,144.95	5,495.72
Lakewood-Crandon farms	144,640.50	24	144,640.50	6,026.69	24	95,038.89	3,959.95						
	42,927,423.35		5,982,344,482,431.58	5,764.36	3,099	11,904,862.76	4,389.70	670,312.61	255,579.79	185,129.07	79,278.71	519,987.57	354,271.75

1 Operated by Forest Service.

2 These projects recently transferred to Farm Security Administration from Department of the Interior by act of Congress. Amounts of capital investment, sales prices, income, and operating obligations not yet available.

United States Department of Agriculture, Farm Security Administration, status of projects as of June 30, 1942—Continued

PROJECTS ON WHICH NO UNITS HAVE BEEN SOLD

State and project name	Total capital investment	Developed units			Units sold			Income, fiscal year 1942	Operating obligations, fiscal year 1942				Management obligations, fiscal year 1942
		Number of units	Total cost	Average cost	Number of units	Total sales price	Average sales price		Operations and maintenance	Taxes	Insurance	Total	
Alabama:													
Alabama Farm Tenant Security	\$587,617.43	96	\$560,770.44	5,841.36				10,160.51	4,608.43		129.60	\$4,738.03	\$295.00
Alabama scattered farms	168,046.14	28	123,761.80	4,420.06				2,326.77	2,628.29		38.08	2,666.37	50.00
Coffee farms	1,893,593.66	299	1,372,851.47	4,591.48				25,886.83	20,330.33		2,062.21	22,392.54	15,250.03
Arizona: Casa Grande Valley farms	810,859.80	60	299,402.05	4,323.37				23,953.32	933.73	\$4,283.91	1,846.02	7,063.66	7,712.90
Arkansas:													
St. Francis River farms	501,606.53	86	337,854.75	3,928.54				27,948.03	3,848.68	5,663.07	1,646.00	11,157.75	4,404.82
Townes farms	172,477.50	31	127,874.44	4,124.98				6,296.32	195.50	710.51		906.01	4,404.64
Trumann farms	263,718.98	56	239,243.72	4,272.21				26,510.05	4,232.94	3,586.00	1,999.71	9,818.65	4,455.96
Florida: Florida scattered farms	394,159.47	69	394,159.47	5,712.46				4,660.45	671.79		470.00	1,141.79	6,767.20
Georgia:													
Briar patch farms	296,888.44	22	181,704.87	8,259.31				1,151.00	1,641.83		237.73	1,879.56	2,951.59
Georgia scattered farms	24,460.23	7	15,959.96	2,279.99				50.00			29.52	79.52	20.00
Greene County project	841,428.82	125	201,807.29	2,334.46				5,073.92			232.00	232.00	375.00
Irwinville	910,894.47	105	744,696.57	7,092.06				14,882.59	6,711.59	640.00	1,674.31	9,025.90	7,462.60
Piedmont homesteads	651,360.11	50	521,219.67	10,424.39				2,239.26	2,422.01			2,422.01	5,755.34
Wolf Creek	237,817.11	24	183,320.66	7,638.36				1,852.37	429.78		923.23	1,353.01	4,327.93
Indiana: Wabash farms	1,241,451.86	122	1,231,645.25	10,095.45				16,672.07	11,135.21		1,563.43	12,698.64	6,170.37
Kansas: Kansas scattered farms	67,005.44	7	67,005.44	9,572.21				1,230.02	642.00	629.03	721.87	1,992.90	5.00
Louisiana: Terrebonne	527,966.52	71	327,058.07	4,606.45					320.74	2,893.21		3,213.95	
Michigan: Cheboygan farms	15,858.41	3	15,858.41	5,286.14				90.00					
Minnesota: Thief River Falls farms	949,241.67	111	916,425.39	8,256.08				11,343.31	5,457.08		2.76	5,459.84	5,614.36
Mississippi:													
Mileston	831,403.28	106	666,001.18	6,283.03					85.60	9,244.39		9,329.99	7,417.62
Richton homesteads	215,599.95	26	183,490.31	7,057.32				768.34	770.98	970.67		1,741.65	1,517.48
Missouri:													
LaForge farms	779,406.94	101	666,550.51	6,599.51				22,103.16	11,933.77	38.87		11,972.64	5,607.11
Osage farms	965,226.37	86	519,682.43	6,042.82				14,732.28	4,589.87		7,948.23	12,538.10	6,040.78
Montana: Kinsey flats	737,652.46	80	622,814.13	7,785.18									7,554.15
Nebraska:													
Fairbury farmsteads	76,879.32	11	51,535.69	4,685.06				457.60	3,599.43	136.74	597.12	4,333.29	25.00
Falls City homesteads	102,572.20	10	41,544.20	4,154.42					82.00	252.83		1,028.51	25.00
Grand Island farmsteads	66,490.03	10	46,040.37	4,604.04				759.75	480.00	214.73	540.80	1,235.53	25.00
Kearney farmsteads	97,072.63	10	42,234.31	4,223.43				2,296.78	1,955.70	675.45	544.96	3,176.11	
Loup City farmsteads	102,625.54	11	49,758.27	4,523.48				96.78	1,133.39	1,608.82	800.94	3,543.15	70.00
Scottsbluff farmsteads	231,695.55	23	132,002.58	5,739.24				398.01	1,626.96	2,246.51	1,347.03	5,220.50	4,550.54
South Sioux City farmsteads	111,789.13	22	83,690.77	3,804.13				1,226.35	822.07	719.76	1,142.64	2,684.47	31.00
Two Rivers	544,050.66	40	286,525.14	7,163.13				60.00	2,675.06		831.43	4,906.49	4,792.54
New Mexico:													
Bosque	677,022.82	42	595,469.61	14,177.85				3,885.36	3,460.65	9,289.00		12,749.65	4,776.27
Dona Ana farms	24,467.82	5	34,467.82	6,893.56				2,621.76	55.00	414.07		469.07	
New Mexico farms	189,390.82	22	188,321.59	4,014.62				3,969.33	1,592.79			1,592.79	4,046.71
North Carolina:													
North Carolina scattered farms	174,633.43	25	174,633.43	6,985.37				3,912.58	2,534.03		101.94	2,635.97	3,294.70
Penderlea homesteads	2,277,080.37	186	1,486,149.42	7,990.05				10,857.03	12,359.41	4,162.08	3.55	16,523.04	13,293.94
North Dakota: North Dakota scattered farms	12,041.68	2	9,770.68	4,885.34						86.98		86.98	
Ohio:													
Scioto Farms	1,950,951.15	133	1,432,260.80	10,768.88				36,937.55	10,189.66		1.38	10,191.04	7,399.96
Oklahoma: 101 ranch farms	647,043.47	40	421,139.40	10,528.48				11,536.11	1,664.88	1,801.98	285.42	3,752.28	5,029.52
Pennsylvania: Northampton farms	149,234.86	6	148,395.38	24,732.58				4,962.02	819.00	455.63	449.08	1,723.71	1,086.87
South Carolina:													
Ashwood plantation	1,919,572.70	161	1,362,952.34	8,465.54				10,141.29	10,827.31	10,653.00	2.00	21,482.31	12,887.81
South Carolina Farm Tenant Security	445,943.57	55	420,041.54	7,637.12				3,442.66	2,349.80	2,358.00	1,922.00	6,629.80	125.00
South Carolina scattered farms	68,439.87	22	68,439.87	3,110.00				418.00	1,328.68	263.00	706.74	2,298.42	75.00
Tiverton farms	85,575.81	29	85,575.81	2,950.89				152.00	288.30	328.00	1,090.40	1,706.70	4,355.72
South Dakota: Sioux Falls	218,927.83	14	97,668.76	6,976.34				1,415.35	3,612.90		1,314.04	4,927.54	2,156.66
Texas:													
Fannin farms	269,096.92	38	286,483.19	6,223.24				5,482.58	956.27	945.75		1,902.02	4,970.99
Ropesville farms	668,677.42	76	641,038.19	8,434.71				34,224.10	6,803.70			6,803.70	5,536.45
Wichita Valley farms	928,733.94	91	807,670.07	8,775.50				15,147.89	6,588.82	12,582.30		19,171.12	6,357.22
Woodlake community	651,446.20	101	474,000.32	4,693.07				4,219.88	3,732.59		51.11	3,783.70	5,488.11
Virginia: Shenandoah homesteads	1,043,454.48	151	858,947.69	5,688.40				9,204.73	5,698.06	2,831.00	4,245.65	12,774.71	9,370.95
Wisconsin:													
Drummond Forest community	247,948.61	32	210,623.03	6,581.97	(1)	(1)	(1)	3,092.49	3,439.00			3,439.00	
Monroe County retirement	18,507.78	6	17,519.51	2,919.92				1,145.25					
Northern Pine retirement homesteads	20,118.37	9	20,118.37	2,235.37				863.45		548.36	278.40	826.76	25.60
Total	27,618,406.57	3,154	21,096,146.43	6,688.69				392,857.28	173,665.61	84,065.08	37,044.18	295,374.87	203,966.44

PROJECTS UNDEVELOPED

Alabama: West central Alabama farms	\$5,522.00												
Arkansas: Kelso farms	44,712.98									\$3,039.00		\$3,039.00	\$1,704.96
Colorado:													
Colorado scattered farms	2,102.00	1								79.65		79.65	
Las Animas farms	1,758.60												
Florida: Jacksonville homesteads	19,322.87				(1)	(1)	(1)						
Illinois: Southern Illinois homesteads	69,680.03												
Indiana: Rehabilitation demonstration farms	6,807.74	2											
Michigan:													
Au Sable area	21,049.88	1						\$171.50					
Potato warehouse	33,568.17							2,584.42	\$92.00			92.00	
Saginaw Valley	328,187.51	33						18,572.83	8,727.62	802.00		9,529.62	1,853.55

1 Operated by Forest Service.

2 Transferred to the Navy Department.

United States Department of Agriculture, Farm Security Administration, status of projects as of June 30, 1942—Continued

PROJECTS UNDEVELOPED—continued

State and project name	Total capital investment	Developed units			Units sold			Income, fiscal year 1942	Operating obligations, fiscal year 1942				Management obligations, fiscal year 1942
		Number of units	Total cost	Average cost	Number of units	Total sales price	Average sales price		Operations and maintenance	Taxes	Insurance	Total	
Mississippi: Mississippi rehabilitation farms.....	285.19									\$16.00		\$16.00	
Nebraska: Republican Valley farmsteads.....	7,154.19	1						\$150.00					
New Mexico: El Pueblo grazing project.....	79,268.27							86.42	\$1,165.00		\$6.88	1,171.88	
New Mexico scattered farms.....	4,636.60	1						103.00					
Silver City farms.....	21,548.85	4											
Oklahoma: Tulsa County homesteads.....	15,023.32	1						320.63					
South Dakota: Spearfish.....	32,233.51	2				\$32,000.00		86.21					
Tennessee: Goodlettsville farms.....	15,360.00					11,100.00							
Texas: Mexia colony.....	71,033.41							813.63		346.00		346.00	
Nacogdoches farms.....	80,938.32	1							147.71			147.71	2,845.42
McLennan farms (Waco).....	244,845.74	20			(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	5,263.21		939.87	526.95	1,466.82	41.98
Virginia: Colonial acres.....	4,555.14	20											
Wisconsin: Langlade and Oneida project.....	21,944.03												
West Bend farms.....	7,060.11	2				4,000.00		4,262.00					
Wisconsin scattered farms.....	9,412.98	5											
Vulcan Corporation.....	600.00												
Total.....	1,148,611.64	74				47,100.00		32,413.85	10,132.33	5,222.52	533.83	15,888.68	6,445.91

PROJECTS TRANSFERRED TO FEDERAL PUBLIC HOUSING AUTHORITY

Alabama: Bankhead farms.....	\$1,046,420.80	100	\$722,052.80	\$7,220.53	100	\$194,370.00	\$1,943.70	\$342.02					
Cahaba.....	2,760,610.47	287	1,807,709.13	6,298.64				68,446.67	\$33,453.86		\$46.59	\$33,500.45	\$16,123.83
Greenwood homesteads.....	827,835.77	83	537,019.12	6,470.11	83	162,291.00	1,955.31	3,493.79					
Mount Olive homesteads.....	618,162.84	75	504,038.52	6,720.51	75	151,187.00	2,015.83	2,862.77					
Palmerdale homesteads.....	938,865.08	102	604,988.11	6,519.49	102	100,681.00	1,868.44	3,818.68					
Tuskegee homesteads.....	18,590.00												
Arizona: Arizona part-time farms.....	564,013.05	91	332,691.38	3,655.95				7,825.09	9,586.87	3,060.98	1,547.10	14,294.95	
Phoenix homesteads.....	104,869.28	25	92,184.70	3,687.39	25	89,150.00	3,566.00	99.50					
California: El Monte homesteads.....	292,476.81	100	260,868.91	2,608.69	100	299,400.00	2,994.00	3,459.98					
San Fernando Homesteads.....	102,065.23	40	88,725.13	2,218.13	40	105,960.00	2,649.00	1,232.92					
Colorado: Denver homesteads.....	120,095.94	3						4,725.11	351.00	700.00		1,051.00	4.00
Illinois: Lake County homesteads.....	554,745.92	53	545,456.07	10,291.62	47	186,467.00	3,967.38	11,926.77	2,997.86	1,696.38	1,648.27	6,342.51	1,585.46
Indiana: Decatur homesteads.....	157,279.94	48	146,955.48	3,061.57	48	156,140.00	3,252.91	4,240.99					
Iowa: Granger homesteads.....	216,189.87	50	206,175.77	4,123.52				9,756.80	1,357.68			1,357.68	4,783.17
Maryland: Greenbelt.....	13,701,817.17	890	8,819,732.66	9,909.81				550,661.46	204,219.83	98,515.22	9.71	302,744.76	33,256.67
Michigan: Ironwood homesteads.....	1,373,138.48	132	1,056,762.87	8,005.78				25,810.09	8,603.00		6,673.86	15,276.86	5,018.11
Minnesota: Austin acres.....	213,227.87	44	185,359.33	4,212.71	44	63,796.00	1,449.91	1,686.96					1,112.70
Duluth homesteads.....	983,984.30	84	865,552.56	10,304.20	84	225,742.00	2,687.40	7,755.84					2,136.92
Mississippi: Hattiesburg homesteads.....	75,648.78	24	60,518.18	2,521.59	24	49,720.00	2,071.67	94.20					1,317.65
Magnolia gardens.....	73,556.46	25	71,286.85	2,851.47	25	60,000.00	2,400.00						1,400.99
McComb homesteads.....	91,452.52	20	77,962.27	3,898.11	18	21,910.00	1,217.22	1,592.24	698.00	306.00	773.84	1,777.84	1,394.00
Tupelo homesteads.....	139,247.12	35	121,446.93	3,469.91	(²)	(²)	(²)	431.48		341.13		341.13	
Tupelo suburban gardens.....	29,047.32												
New Jersey: Jersey homesteads.....	3,402,382.27	206	2,165,372.63	10,511.52				39,384.37	10,943.28	12,370.10	661.58	23,974.96	6,674.19
New York: Monroe County homesteads.....	43,020.53	2						440.00					
Ohio: Greenhills.....	11,860,627.53	737	8,012,917.17	10,872.34				314,553.50	182,799.03	52,461.29		235,200.32	32,630.27
Mahoning Gardens Home.....	46,277.71												
Pennsylvania: Westmoreland homesteads.....	2,510,469.81	255	1,117,737.08	4,383.28				31,528.54	20,440.20	8,142.10		28,582.30	10,848.28
South Carolina: Greenville homesteads.....	20,382.78												
LaFrance homesteads.....	6,509.71												
Saluda garden homesteads.....	21,351.01												
Tennessee: Cumberland homesteads.....	3,267,345.10	202	1,989,543.36	7,593.68	209	431,263.72	2,063.46	17,876.90	8,436.23	11,438.30	15.10	19,889.63	12,901.08
Texas: Beauxart gardens.....	143,027.62	50	119,250.66	2,385.02	50	125,000.00	2,500.00	3,450.01					
Dalworthington gardens.....	325,712.35	79	237,743.00	3,009.42	79	150,000.00	1,898.74	4,171.80					
Houston gardens.....	283,668.10	100	221,793.65	2,217.94	100	275,586.00	2,755.86	7,549.60					
Three Rivers gardens.....	162,943.43	50	118,824.32	2,376.49	50	82,650.00	1,653.00						
Wichita gardens.....	187,527.85	62	170,208.54	2,745.30	62	131,716.00	2,124.45	3,850.38					
Virginia: Aberdeen gardens.....	1,353,896.29	159	1,008,232.30	6,341.08	2	4,411.22	2,205.61	25,727.81	9,120.29	3,537.00	4,903.90	17,561.19	5,424.24
Washington: Longview homesteads.....	104,097.58	60	181,533.23	3,025.55	60	174,900.00	2,915.00	4,704.72					
West Virginia: Arthurdale.....	2,744,724.09	165	1,439,459.21	8,724.00				\$ 27,250.00	27,743.89	4,695.54		32,439.43	10,869.14
Red House.....	1,506,397.82	130	629,996.43	4,199.98				\$ 26,485.00	6,756.13	1,706.09	4.07	8,466.29	9,906.50
Tygart Valley homesteads.....	2,080,213.99	195	759,385.01	3,894.28				\$ 33,950.00	12,016.13	1,999.23	11,500.88	25,925.24	13,228.62
Wisconsin: Greendale.....	10,638,465.62	640	6,601,376.44	10,314.65				301,478.95	168,273.81	108,945.00		277,218.81	32,545.60
Total.....	65,808,271.69	5,483	41,940,864.09	7,649.25	1,427	3,332,240.94	2,335.13	1,552,664.74	707,897.09	309,914.36	28,193.90	1,046,005.35	205,077.09

¹ National Youth Administration project.² Transferred to Interior Department.³ Record of receipts transferred to Federal Public Housing Authority. These amounts are estimates.

FOOD PRODUCTION—THE CANNING INDUSTRY

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief statement on the subject of the canning industry.

The production of food is one of the most important programs with which this Nation is now concerned. Great projects lie before us, and in all these projects the role which food will play will be of the utmost importance. We must feed and sustain our own armed forces; we must fulfill our lease-lend commitments to our allies; we must provide full and ample food for our civilian population; and, moreover, we must supply needed foodstuffs—when they are liberated—to all those people who now suffer at the brutal hands of their German and Japanese conquerors. These are worthy and prodigious tasks, Mr. President; such tasks as will require the most capable management, the most exhaustive development, and the most effective coordination of all our food-production resources, if the goals which we have set for ourselves are to be attained.

It is an incontrovertible fact that the results which have marked our efforts thus far leave much to be desired. There is scarcely one segment of the food-production industry which is making its most complete and effective contribution to our food-production program. For this condition neither the industries nor the managers and workers in those industries are at fault. The farmer, the producer, the processor, the wholesaler, and the retailer are all doing everything within their power to see to it that each and every one of these food-production goals is met.

But the fact remains that the agencies created by the Government to coordinate, support, and assist in this great food-production program have failed in many ways to perform the tasks which have been entrusted to them. The result has brought confusion, doubt, and delay into every field of food production; and it has, moreover, brought decreased production in many important food lines, decreases which, if continued for any length of time, will certainly pose grave problems for America and her allies.

Mr. President, I have talked with many of those who are directly concerned with our food-production program, and they are one in denouncing the overlapping authority of the various agencies concerned, the multiple jurisdiction of agencies which now seek to operate this program, the lack of cooperation between these various agencies, the impossibility of getting a clear-cut decision on any point of issue, and the wealth of confusion, inefficiency, and red tape which surrounds the efforts of those governmental agencies which are concerned with the food-production program. This is such a condition as will lead inevitably to the collapse of our entire war economy, as well as our traditional system of free enterprise, if it is allowed to persist unremedied.

Mr. President, only this week I had occasion to meet with the Pennsylvania representatives of the American canning industry. For more than 9 months, these

representatives and this industry have been contacting the various Federal agencies concerned with the food-production program, hoping to achieve something in the way of a clear statement of the Government's policy, the regulations that would be in force, and other similar statements which every businessman must have if he is to run his organization effectively during wartime. Now I will not recount here all the frustration, confusion, doubt, disagreement, and mismanagement which the operators of this industry found among, and received from, these various agencies here in Washington. Suffice it to say that after the passing of 9 long months, and with the harvesting season right at hand, the canners in America still do not know where they stand, nor do they know what they are to be permitted or expected to do by these various Government agencies.

Mr. President, Mr. Summers and Mr. Warehime, two of the representatives of the canning industry in Pennsylvania, have written me in some detail describing a seven-point program which they and their associates in the canning industry feel should be adopted, if the food-production program is to go forward uninhibited, and if the food-production goals which we have set for ourselves are to be attained. Because I feel that the recommendations outlined in their letter are sound and workable, because I believe that their recommendations might well be applied to every aspect of our food-production effort, and because I feel that they might well be called to the attention of those who are in any way concerned with the all-important food-production program, I ask unanimous consent that the letter may be printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW FREEDOM, PA., June 7, 1943.

SENATOR JAMES J. DAVIS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR DAVIS: The food industry and the canning industry, in particular, are in what we might describe as a rather desperate position due to the confusion, lack of direction, lack of authority, and the impractical methods applied by various war agencies to the industry. While authority is not particularly lacking, yet it overlaps in many agencies so that one agency cannot decide a relatively simple question until they have the assent of possibly two or more other agencies. If only one of the latter happens to disagree, then the entire question is unanswered. Frankly, we are at our wits' end as to how to proceed. We have been contacting, among others, the Office of Price Administration, the War Labor Board, and the Food Distribution Administration (formerly Department of Agriculture) since early last November. We have been annoyed and plagued with innumerable vague promises and cannot brook further delay, as the harvests are now ready. We intend to start harvesting peas this week.

Food processors individually and collectively have attempted to bring some order out of the chaotic conditions in Washington by applying to and recommending to the various agencies in question. Please remember that this is over a 9-month period, and we still have no answers to the major portion of our problems. The National Canners' Asso-

ciation, through its legislative committee, has presented a great bulk of testimony, some of which was solicited by these agencies and some which was volunteered by the association. The legislative committee has appeared before the House Agriculture Committee, the Smith committee of the Senate, as well as numerous agencies, all without results. The industry has, therefore, made out a program of seven points which we believe would be a great help in solving some of these vexing questions.

Point No. 1. Employment of personnel who are practical and not inexperienced theorists.

There are definitely men available in the canning and allied industries and also other walks of life who can definitely do a good job for various Government agencies, mainly for Office of Price Administration, who are willing to come to Washington to do a job for the Government for the canning industry, but at the present time under the set-up would not come due to interference and also other powers who would block their recommendations. This has been the case in the past years as the Office of Price Administration had two experienced and very practical men, namely, Mr. Daniel Gerber and Mr. Norman Sorensen. Conditions were so bad in Office of Price Administration that they were forced to resign as their recommendations were never taken and their policy makers would not take their advice in conferences or in any other phase of the policies of Office of Price Administration.

Point No. 2. Nineteen hundred and forty-two formula prices were enacted for all canned foods, and in most cases did not work a hardship on the canners, and the formula was flexible enough for this type of canner to work without losing money or to change his style of pack; also, it did not interfere with production. Again we wish to refer you to the testimony of Mr. Sorensen before the Smith agricultural committee that not more than 300 hardship cases came before Office of Price Administration, and also if these experienced men's recommendations would have been followed these hardship cases could have been disposed of in very short order.

The Office of Price Administration decided early last fall to compel dollars-and-cents regional ceilings on the canners. Various delegations from the canning industry pleaded with Office of Price Administration not to enforce these regulations, and testified before them the unworkable conditions on their dollars-and-cents ceilings. As an example, with a low-grade packer with no personnel and very little overhead, it would be necessary under the dollars-and-cents ceilings for the packers who are producing the most cases per plant and who have the organization and equipment to do the job which the Government needs, to pack at a loss under the dollars-and-cents ceilings which have been announced for peas, beans, tomatoes, and corn.

The formula prices have worked last year and Dr. Galbraith admitted at a Senate hearing (Dr. Galbraith recently resigned from Office of Price Administration) that to the best of his knowledge no canner profited on this basis of the formula system of Office of Price Administration last year.

The fact that dollars and cents ceilings are unworkable for all canners in the area, also that formula price has worked in 1942 and also the fact that other commodities such as lima beans, asparagus, tomato products, and numerous others will have a formula price for 1943, why not have all canned foods under the formula price? It would be well to point out that everything Office of Price Administration has done since last fall has been against production and quoting from Representative CHARLES A. WOLVERTON, Republican from New Jersey, at a hearing last Thursday, he stated "From a business point of view the canners would have been

justified in doing little or nothing to pack this year's crops of vegetables. It is only their patriotism which assures our armed forces and the country of adequate canned foods this year."

Point No. 3. Although grade labeling, that is, the grade being put on the label, has been discarded by Office of Price Administration, the regulation still works such a hardship on the industry that it is still almost impossible to speed production by the mandatory method of putting grades on invoices.

The canning industry has built up good-will reputation on their use of brands or commercial grades. The most popular items on the grocers' shelves are being bought by consumers by the brand or commercial-grade method. It has proved to be the most practical for consumers' good will, quality, and production. If this is recognized as true in peacetime, then with all the extra work and the problems of distribution which confront us during wartime, it is not necessary to change and establish policies at this time for the most production. In case of any disputes, the industry has always settled arguments by the arbitrary system which included a panel of three men, one representing the buyer, one the seller, and a disinterested party.

Point No. 4. Meetings were held with the Office of Price Administration officials in regard to increased costs for 1943 and the price ceilings as announced for 1943 were in some cases lower than those the canners had for 1942. The canners proved by cost sheets their increased costs for 1943. The Office of Price Administration up to the present writing has not recognized any increased costs which the canners proved to them that they would have; also the Office of Price Administration would not divulge where they got their costs for 1942. The main increased costs are labor and overhead, as plants which used to pack on a 12-month basis are now cut back to 4 months, due to the shortage of tin. Canners are not objecting to 50 percent of their production being cut, as they realize tin is not available, but organizations have to be kept together and paid which puts a higher overhead cost on the summer months pack of fresh fruits and vegetables. As stated in a preceding paragraph, Dr. Galbraith submitted in testifying to the Senate hearing that in 1942 there were no canners who profited through the Office of Price Administration set-up, and since price ceilings in 1943 are less than or not more than 1942, and with the increased costs which canners will have, there will definitely be a loss for some packers on some products and some packing operations for this coming season. In addition, canners in each State were forced to certify and pay growers minimum prices. The Commodity Credit Corporation paid back to each canner so he in turn could distribute to his growers this increased cost and in the case of Pennsylvania, this was not done for beans and tomatoes. The canner will have to lose this increased cost because the Office of Price Administration has not recognized the increase to growers in their price ceilings.

Point No. 4 is that the increased cost of the 1943 packs shall be reflected in the ceiling prices. Early this year after meetings with our local War Board of the Department of Agriculture, we and other canners, following their recommendations contracted fruits and vegetables with our farmer-growers at the prices recommended. We received assurance by the Department of Agriculture that the ceilings as issued by Office of Price Administration would include subsidies by the Commodity Credit Corporation to equal the advances paid to farmers. In this manner inflation would be checked and the ceiling prices would be set at relatively the same levels as March 1942. However, in setting the ceiling prices the Office of Price Administration has used higher produce costs than last

year which does not return the processor the recommended advances to the farmer. As an example, in southern Pennsylvania we paid \$19 per ton for tomatoes last year. The War Board recommended \$27 a ton. Subsequently we contracted at this figure. However, in computing the ceiling price the Office of Price Administration figured the cost at \$23 a ton—\$4 above the price of last year. The Commodity Credit Corporation took the position that since Office of Price Administration had figured on this basis that the subsidy would only amount to \$4 per ton rather than the \$8 differential between 1942 and 1943. The Office of Price Administration attempted to justify this with the statement to the effect that regardless of the raw produce price used by them, the difference would be reflected between our cost and their ceiling price. This statement is undoubtedly true provided their ceiling price reflected this difference in cost. However it does not. Our 1942 cost based on \$19 gives us a cost which is almost identical with the Office of Price Administration's ceiling price which was figured at \$23. In other words, the processor is penalized \$4 a ton. This is not an individual case but is the average case. The processor is in no position to absorb this difference. Recent meetings with Office of Price Administration and Food and Drug Administration and Commodity Credit Corporation have resulted in these agencies all admitting that the above is correct. They also advise that they expect to issue an amendment to MPR 306 correcting this situation. However, this amendment will again only include part of this \$4 in question. In other words, as a compromise they expect to give us \$3 instead of \$4. In this particular situation Pennsylvania is harder hit than any other of the 25 or more States packing tomatoes, although the condition is equally true to a great extent on other products in other States.

The above refers only to raw produce. No provision has been made for the increased costs in overhead, labor, or supplies. Due to the restriction on tin, our 1943 production will be cut approximately 40 percent. We have no complaint with this limitation order on tin plate. Due to the shortage of this commodity, it is only right and just that it should be limited. However, a 40-percent cut in production results in a higher overhead cost per unit. The Office of Price Administration will not even consider this question. In regard to wages, the canning industry wants its wages raised. The freeze order of September 1942 froze our wages at a low level and those of war industries at a high level. Subsequently, agricultural labor has been permitted sufficient increases, but this has not been extended to processing labor. As it stands now, we cannot secure the labor at the wages permitted, which leaves us two alternatives: One to proceed with our pack and openly violate the wage freeze; the other is to let the crops rot in the fields. Certainly, very few processors intend to follow the latter course. However, if we take the former course we will be in very serious legal difficulties. Numerous applications for relief by both individuals and communities have been made through the War Labor Board. Only a very few of these have been acted upon. Originally, the Office of Price Administration made public promises that if the War Labor Board authorized wage increases then the Office of Price Administration would permit these wage increases to be added to the ceiling costs. During the last 6 weeks the Office of Price Administration has reversed themselves on this policy. Apparently all of the petitions to the War Labor Board are now tabled due to the so-called policy makers in Office of Price Administration, the "hold the line" order, or the coal strike. In one case it has come to our attention: A Utah canner was authorized to increase wages by the War Labor Board but at the same time

was not permitted to include these increases in his ceiling price. He has instructed his growers that he cannot handle the pea crop, and therefore has notified them to harvest the pea crop as hay for cattle. In another case a pay increase was authorized by the War Labor Board and Mr. Byrnes for asparagus cutters in California. Here again the Office of Price Administration has not provided for this increase to be added to the ceiling costs, with the result that the asparagus packers on the west coast have now been packing for 60 days, paying the wages authorized, and yet they cannot sell their pack until the Office of Price Administration provides them with a ceiling price. There is none at present. Valuable time is being lost, and warehouses are being congested, and the food is not available to consumers until the Office of Price Administration makes this decision.

Point No. 5: The industry is opposed to subsidies on principle, but if they are employed with price control, the said subsidies, together with a ceiling price, should cover the cost of processing plus a reasonable profit. In every case it should be made clear that the processor acts only as an agent for the ultimate beneficiary and is never the recipient of any subsidy.

We, as processors, do not approve of subsidies in principle and we wish there was some other method to be found. However, it appears that this is about the only method available. As noted above, these subsidies do not return the differential requested by the war boards of the Department of Agriculture. In the case of these subsidies we are simply the agents of the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Department of Agriculture and we would like the public to thoroughly understand that the subsidies referred to are turned over in full to the grower. This has not been made clear and in many cases employees have understood that the entire industry was subsidized.

Point No. 6: The transfer of complete control over manpower and wages of processing employees to the War Food Administration where the responsibility for production now rests.

While Mr. Chester Davis has control over production, yet many of his decisions are hindered and delayed due to the fact that he has to refer his decisions to the War Labor Board on labor and Office of Price Administration on price ceilings. More frequently than not, no decision is forthcoming because one of the three agencies disagree on principle. It would be a great deal more satisfactory if one agency could handle all problems in relation to food production. At the same time Mr. Davis would probably be just as helpless as Mr. Prentiss Brown if he were hamstrung and obstructed like Mr. Brown, with orders coming down from above. As we see it, it is not absolutely necessary to transfer all of these functions to one agency provided there could be some relief from the impractical personalities involved and the impractical theories under which Mr. Brown is now forced to work.

Point No. 7: In all cases the experience of the industry should be consulted in advance of promulgation of every regulation as required by law.

The law provides that industries shall be consulted. This has not been the practice in the past. In a number of instances the industry has been called together supposedly for consultation only to be advised that the regulation had already been made and the industry was, at the time, presented with the results of the agency policy makers. The vast experience which the industry could offer was entirely ignored and the industry is required to work under complex regulations evolved by lawyers and professional economists. In a number of instances, practical men who were in the employment of Office of Price Administration or other agencies made certain specific recommendations. In all

cases these recommendations were entirely ignored, with the result that these capable members of the industry resigned, since they felt that agencies had given proof that their experience and counsel were unwelcome. In this particular instance, we direct your attention to the testimony given by Mr. Norman Sorensen before the Smith committee. A copy of this testimony is attached.

We think it is fairly well agreed that the problem of food is probably second only to munitions so far as the war effort is concerned. It is frequently stated that food will win the war and write the peace. Due to floods, adverse weather conditions, and the conditions outlined above, it is undoubtedly true that the food production of the country during 1943 will be some 5 to 10 percent less than in 1942. The large crop in 1942 was primarily due to unusually good and favorable weather throughout the United States. The food industry has had a cycle of about 6 favorable years so far as weather is concerned, and from weather conditions to date it would appear as though the average were about to catch up with the industry. There is nothing much we can do now about 1943's food production as the crops are in the ground, except to alleviate immediately the squeezes created by the above-outlined conditions. Our best efforts should be directed at this time to food production in 1944 and it is none too early to begin this program.

We leave to you the methods of bringing about compliance and cooperation of the various agencies involved. Possibly this can be brought about through parliamentary procedure or possibly through a tightening of the purse strings. Certainly one of these methods is the only method which promises prompt relief. We do not feel that Congress should necessarily concern itself with the thousands of details. We believe the best method will be to put a competent man in charge, but at the same time see that he has complete and full authority. Any attempt at legislation either for 1943 or 1944 would, we are sure, result in months of unprofitable discussion. No fully comprehensive bill could ever be written on such a complex industry. We trust that you will do anything in your power to alleviate this extremely serious situation which threatens not only the domestic economy but to a large extent our military efforts and that of our allies, who have been made grandiose promises through lend-lease.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES G. SUMMERS, JR., INC.,
STRAN SUMMERS,
HANOVER CANNING CO.,
M. WAREHIME.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, the conditions outlined and the recommendations made in this letter speak for themselves. The recommendations are worthy of every study and consideration—and something very closely resembling such recommendations must immediately be made effective, if the food production program in America is to go forward successfully. The experience encountered by the canning industry is not unique, it has been repeated many times over—by the meat packing industry, by the farming industry, by the dairy industry, and by almost every other major food-producing industry in the Nation.

Mr. President, we must bring order out of this chaos. The divided, overlapping, and incomplete authority now designed to regulate this particular program is vested in no less than seven distinct Federal agencies. And among these agencies, cooperation and harmony has not been the order of the day.

Indeed, a quite converse situation is in existence. In the meantime the food-production capacity and the food-producing industries of America are made to suffer because of this unbearable and inefficient administrative set-up.

Mr. President, I submit that immediate action must be taken to effectively remedy these conditions, unless we are prepared to see America lose the battle of food production, and possibly the battle for self-preservation as well.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

Mr. LANGER obtained the floor.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I do not intend to take up the time of the Senate with a prolonged discussion of the subject which has been under debate during today, but I do not wish to permit this opportunity to pass without expressing my unqualified approval of the Farm Security Administration program in the State of Montana.

I believe all Senators are aware of the conditions which prevailed throughout the West as a result of the depression and the drought which passed over the country during the thirties. As a result of those conditions in my State and other similarly affected areas it was absolutely necessary for some rehabilitation program to be established and carried through to aid the hard-pressed farmers. The program of the Farm Security Administration as carried out in my State has been most effective, and it has accomplished results there which will have a lasting benefit.

I have in my hand a letter written by a former administrator of the Farm Security Administration in Montana, but not now connected with the Administration in any manner, in which he discusses the program in my State and points out the broad benefits which it accomplished. I ask that the letter be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, in my State the draft has revealed the fact that sons of farmers of Montana were able to meet qualifications for service in a very high percentage. This, in my judgment, was a result of the aid which was given to our farmers during the distressing period of the depression and the drought. It salvaged many a Montana farm family. I myself have passed over those sections of the State which were severely hit during that period when widespread bankruptcy and ruin faced our citizens. I can say here now that the Farm Security Administration in Montana has accomplished results of

enduring benefit, and it would be a great misfortune to my State and to the Nation if the Farm Security program were not continued.

EXHIBIT 1

BOZEMAN, MONT.,
May 5, 1943.

Mr. JAMES G. PATTON,
National President, Farmers' Union,
Denver, Colo.

DEAR MR. PATTON: Since I have severed my relationship with the Farm Security Administration, I feel at liberty to state my views concerning the work of this organization.

In the first place the philosophy back of the organization is sound and should have the support of all people who are interested in maintaining democracy in this country. Due to the various programs inaugurated by the Farm Security Administration this country was better prepared to meet the situation relative to food production than it would have been otherwise. The fact that farm people have been taught to produce and preserve foods for home use, the work of this organization means much during the crisis through which we are passing.

There has existed for many years a "no-man's land" between the work done by the land-grant colleges and a large segment of our agricultural population. It is true that the Extension Service was founded with the idea of carrying the work of the land-grant colleges and experiment stations into the rural areas but it is also self-evident that the Extension Service has failed miserably in its assignment in that it has only touched a small percent of the people who actually need the assistance it was in a position to render.

The Farm Security Administration, on the other hand, has reached down to this lower level and given help in a financial, social, and technical way. There is proof on every side that these people to whom the Farm Security Administration has extended aid will react as favorably as any other group if they are given an opportunity to do so.

Many of our boys now serving in the armed forces were enabled to do so by reason of the fact that the Farm Security Administration, through its county supervisors and home supervisors, has encouraged and helped people to secure a satisfactory living insofar as necessary foods are concerned.

If you will pardon me I would like to call to your attention a case which I have in mind at this time. There was a large family in the Billings area who, through adverse conditions, came to the Farm Security Administration for aid. It was necessary to give these people assistance for a few years in the way of grants to supplement their loan. The children of this family were undernourished at the time the Farm Security Administration stepped into the picture, but with the assistance the Farm Security Administration gave them they were furnished the means to secure the food necessary to maintain health. As a result of this, one of the boys was enabled to pass a successful physical examination and entered the Air Corps. He was with General Doolittle over Tokyo and lived to come back and do his bit to stimulate the bond drive in Montana.

I recall another situation in Montana in which there were 19 boys called up for induction. Eighteen out of the nineteen passed their physical examination. Eighteen families out of the nineteen had also been assisted by the Farm Security Administration through grants and loans.

While to me as State Director of the program, the loaning part of the program was only one tool with which we had been provided to do a job, people need something besides money. This has been thoroughly demonstrated by the fact that many of them

had had credit before and still had not made a success. With the personnel trained in the philosophy of extending aid in the way of counsel and advice, the majority of these people who are considered poor risks by other lending agencies are demonstrating the fact that loans made on a character basis are just as sound, and oftentimes more so, than loans made on ample chattel security.

More important than the repayment of the loans is the fact that these people form a large segment of our social structure and unless given an opportunity to produce and have security they would become a greater threat to our country and its institutions than foes from the outside.

From my experience I doubt if there is any strong justification for any other governmental loaning agency for agriculture.

The Farm Security Administration's program is the most vital factor in the production and preservation of the essential food needed during the wartime. Its organization has long been geared to do the job in agriculture which was created by the attack upon Pearl Harbor. It is the only agricultural set-up that is geared to do the job in the war period provided sufficient funds and authorities were granted to it. Funds and authorities should be provided that would enable it to assist farmers in securing homes of their own or in enlarging un-economic units, also to purchase, develop, and distribute to tenant farmers large tracts of land now owned by absentee landlords. Funds and authorities should be provided to extend and aid in the development of farmer cooperatives for buying, selling, and processing.

Since the Extension Service has failed in carrying necessary educational work to those who most need it, the Farm Security Administration should be encouraged to enlarge its activities in this field.

It is true that the Farm Security Administration has made what some might be inclined to call mistakes. Whether they were mistakes or not time will tell. Since the Farm Security Administration has been a pioneer in new fields of human endeavor regarding the helping of those in a disadvantaged status economically, socially, and educationally, it might be a better term to call the various attempts at human rehabilitation as experiments. There have been many things that the Farm Security Administration has had to learn by trial and error, having no precedent to follow. Any financial loss that society may have or will incur through the funds spent by the Farm Security Administration is compensated a hundredfold by what has been done in the rebuilding of the morale of a large group of our agricultural population. Further than that, through the encouragement given by the Farm Security Administration many people have been stimulated to endeavor to raise their standard of living and to take an interest in giving to their children, who are the future citizens of this country, an opportunity in life.

We cannot estimate in dollars and cents what this means to society. It means that we have removed many boys and girls from the list of potential criminals or wards upon society.

In closing may I urge you, as representatives of the common man, to use your utmost influence to secure for the Farm Security Administration sufficient funds and authorities to enable it to carry on its proper work and also to enlarge its scope of activities.

With kindest personal regards,

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS HORSFORD.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I would have spoken upon the subject of Farm Security Administration anyway, but I have upon my desk thousands of letters from farmers, merchants, and business-

men from North Dakota asking me to do so.

I have before me an advertisement in the Columbus Reporter entitled "We the Merchants and Businessmen of Lignite and Columbus Respectfully Urge Congress To Provide for:"

And it mentions the F. S. A. among other things.

I have another advertisement from the Watford Association of Farmers, made up of merchants and businessmen in the city of Watford City, N. Dak.

I have another advertisement which was inserted in the Flaxton Times by the merchants of Flaxton, N. Dak.

I have here a front-page article in the Powers Lake Herald of May 21, 1943.

I have here a petition which appeared as an advertisement in the Bowbells Tribune by the merchants of Bowbells, N. Dak.

I also have a half-page advertisement which appeared in the County Record on May 20, 1943, which was paid for, the advertisement said, by the Hettinger Civic Association, made up of hundreds of businessmen.

I have here a full-page advertisement which appears in the Mott Pioneer Press, stating that the advertisement is sponsored and paid for by the following businessmen of Mott, N. Dak. They are the same 50 businessmen, the names of whom I wish to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the names were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Wick's Hotel, Mott Drug Store, Log Cabin, Defoe Mortuary, White City Mercantile, Gamble Store, Sax Motor Co., Wolf Den, Mott Pioneer Press, R. A. Grant, S. S. Reishus, O. H. Opland, Anonymous, Chas. Senn, Wm. Rueter, Standard Oil Co., Mott Shoe Hospital, C. J. Hardmeyer, Ferguson-Olien Shop, O. K. Rubber Welders, Busy Bee Service, Mott Dry Cleaners, N. L. Sauer, Pete Senn, Mrs. N. A. Mosher, J. C. Roster, E. H. Yonaka, Frank Bigler, Alexander Roll, Margules Store, J. C. Penney Co., J. B. Murphy, Fletsam Hardware, Mott Supply Co., Red Owl Store, Occident Elevator, Equity Elevator, Mott Mill & Elevator Co., Kramer's Service Station, Thompson Yards, Inc., Mott Blacksmith Shop, Peter Boehm, Grosz Meat Market, Olien's Repair Shop, Mott Implement, Wangsvicks', Schafer's Market, Johnson Standard Service, Mott Hide & Fur Co., Mees Implement, Weiler Plumbing & Heating, Mott Creamery, Commercial Bank of Mott, Mott Equity Exchange.

Mr. LANGER. I have a full-page advertisement appearing in the Bowman County Pioneer, signed by approximately 50 businessmen, whose names I also wish to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks. This advertisement was published on the 27th of May 1943.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the names were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

L. L. Molde, Martin Beckwell, Roy J. Messmer, F. U. Co-Op Store, J. C. Stuber, Stone & Puckett, Bowman Co. Pioneer, H. V. Burmeister, James Quinn, C. T. Olson, Bowman

Drug Co., Omer Sheets, Andy's Bar, Stanley Benson, H. E. Myer, A. N. Gausemel, H. G. Hinkley, H. F. Olson, Gus Schade, John Schade, H. H. Dahl, J. M. Ryan, C. H. Peterson, H. N. Fisher, Fritz Schade, H. J. Bagley, F. G. Beyer, Bruno Klug, Otto Schade, Joe DeBode, Bennett Drug, Lawrence Septon, Bert Patterson, Lyle Stebbins, Wokal Auto Co.

Mr. LANGER. I have also a full page advertisement which was inserted by the Watford City Association of Commerce, and the McKinzie County Farmers' Union, which was published on May 20.

I have another one which was published in the Bowbells Tribune on May 27, 1943, and signed by the Burke County Farmers' Union, Glendon Bryan, president, and Milford L. Sernsen, secretary-treasurer.

I also have here numerous other advertisements with which I will not clutter the RECORD, inserted by businessmen, professional men, and farmers of the State of North Dakota. So today I speak at their behest.

Mr. President, although I am a North Dakota Republican, ever since I have come to the Senate I have voted with the President of the United States, a Democrat, whenever I felt that the President was right. Whenever I felt he was wrong, I voted against him.

I hold in my hand a letter written by the President of the United States on May 29, 1943, addressed to Mr. James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers' Union. The letter reads as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 29, 1943.

JAMES G. PATTON, Esq.,
President, National Farmers' Union,
Denver, Colo.

MY DEAR MR. PATTON: I have your letter of April 8 urging my continued support of the Farm Security Administration. My position on this matter has not changed since my letter of July 2, 1942, written in response to the joint appeal sent me by yourself and leaders of other prominent organizations interested in this agency's continuance.

The necessity for achieving maximum effort from all our farm producers is even more evident today than it was then. The small farmers of the Nation aided by the Farm Security Administration have given an excellent account of their ability and their patriotic determination during the past year. I am sure that with continued assistance they will equal or surpass that record this year.

I am opposed to any step that might impair the work that the Farm Security Administration has been doing among these small farm families.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

Mr. President, it seems to me very odd—and I am not impugning the motives of any Senator in this body—that when big business industrial enterprise is concerned we do not hear any criticism, no matter how much money is squandered, but when the small farmers are concerned, a few defenseless, small farmers, then upon this floor for months past we have heard about the greedy farmers. Only a few months ago we heard how they were impeding the war effort, and upon this floor we heard criticism of Mr. O'Neal, Mr. Goss, Mr. Patton, and of John Brandt, and all the other great

farm leaders of this country; indeed, there were advertisements in some of the newspapers of the East saying that the farmers of the country were so greedy or were so anxious to get rich that they were deliberately impeding the war effort. Upon that occasion I myself rose on the floor to defend the farm leaders.

But, Mr. President, what do we find during the last 2 days? We find the distinguished Senator from the State of North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] delivering a speech impugning the motives of labor. I have that speech before me. The Senator from North Carolina says that he is anxious to assist the President of the United States in holding the line against inflation even though the farmer's price may go up a little bit. He says the workers are going to demand more and there will be a spiral of inflation.

Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators upon this floor away for a few moments from the farmers and from John L. Lewis and the miners, and I call their attention to what I consider to be one of the dirtiest and most contemptible steals that have ever taken place in the United States of America. I refer to the major oil companies and to the large oil interests. We have not heard one word of criticism of them, although in a speech delivered months ago by Representative COFFEE, of the State of Washington, a record was made that showed that the Attorney General of the United States entered into a consent decree by which the large oil interests took from the people of this country anywhere between \$1,500,000,000 and \$3,000,000,000. I hold in my hand that speech, and I have verified the letters which appear in it.

I find, for example, a letter to Mr. Thurman Arnold calling his attention to the fact that suits have been brought against three of the major oil companies and asking that it be not settled until Congress could be consulted. Here I have the answer of Mr. Arnold. There is a second letter dated the 22d day of October 1941, signed by the Attorney General, Francis Biddle, from which I will read a few lines:

It is the intention of Assistant Attorney General Arnold to submit any plan which may be suggested for the settlement of this litigation to the proper congressional committee for its consideration before the Department officially accepts the plan.

Mr. President, what happened? At that time only three major oil companies had been sued, but on the 23d day of December 1941, some 15 or 16 months ago, the Attorney General's office at 10 o'clock in the morning sued 18 more oil companies, and, at 2 o'clock in the afternoon, they signed a consent decree. The Government sued on the same day the consent decree was signed; indeed, even the judge—Judge Pine, of the Federal district court—was so shocked that when the consent decree was taken he was heard to remark, "Ah, the Christmas spirit, I perceive."

Mr. President, up to the present time, aside from a speech delivered by the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], not one voice upon the Senate floor has been raised in protest against

this taking of \$1,500,000,000 out of the pockets of the taxpayers of this country; but when a small appropriation reaches the Senate, which is designed for the benefit of the small farmers in 47 of the 48 States of the Union, we have long, extended debate.

Mr. President, I wish to go further in connection with the oil situation. I desire to show something that happened last November and was covered up.

Mr. President, back in the Taft administration, those who guided the destinies of our Navy were sufficiently farsighted to realize that the secret of victory on the high seas was oil. I come right back, Mr. President, to oil, and I again remind the Senate that on the 23d day of December 1941, there was signed a consent decree which deprived the people of this country of \$1,500,000,000, although the question as to whether the Government had an air-tight case was ably answered by an article in the *Cornell Law Quarterly*, printed in the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD* under date of October 8, 1940, and entitled "Oil—Pipeline Divorcement by Litigation and Legislation" written by Dr. Forrest R. Black, professor of law, attached to the Department of Justice, who spent well over a year in studying the law applicable to the case. He revealed in the article that the Department of Justice believed it had a copper-riveted case. Although the Department believed it had a copper-riveted case, it sued 18 major oil companies on the 23d of December at 10 o'clock in the morning and settled all the lawsuits by 2 o'clock in the afternoon. So we come back to oil to find out who is in charge of this Government, whether the Government is being operated in behalf of the poor people, in behalf of the taxpayer, or in behalf of a bunch of scoundrels and crooks who are robbing the people of this country. If so, we come back to oil once more.

I repeat that back in the Taft administration those who guided the destinies of our Navy were sufficiently farsighted to realize that the secret of victory on the high seas was oil. So, Mr. President, they set aside for the United States Navy some of the finest oil reserves in the entire United States. It was provided that those reserves were to be kept in the ground where bombs could not destroy them, where the oil tanks could not be set afire, and the reserves were to be used at a time when the oil of the rest of the world was running low.

The history of those oil reserves since is well known to us. They have been the object of the covetous hands of the big oil companies. There has been wire pulling; there has been lobbying; there have been little black satchels; there have been a total of \$330,000 paid in bribes by Harry Sinclair and Edward Doheny to get those priceless oil preserves of Teapot Dome, Wyo., and Elk Hills, Calif., into the hands of private interests. So far, however, our Government has resisted private greed; that is, it resisted it until a few months ago; but now I regret to read that this administration has practically given away to the Standard Oil Co. of California the second richest oil preserve in the

world, namely, Elk Hills, known as Naval Oil Reserve No. 1. This reserve has been given to a company which, it is true, has owned a small part of the Elk Hills oil field, a shallow area largely overrun with salt water and containing a very doubtful amount of oil; but because the Standard Oil Co. of California has owned a small corner of the Elk Hills oil field, the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Knox, for reasons best known to himself, has permitted 43,000 acres of the richest oil lands in the United States, second in richness only to one field in Arabia, to be taken over in toto and developed during the next 5 years by the Standard Oil Co. of California.

Furthermore, it may be significant that this oil lease—or a better term might be "oil give-away"—has been given to the company which has placed its high officials in key spots inside the Roosevelt administration. They are Ralph Davies, former vice president of Standard Oil of California, who is now Deputy Petroleum Administrator and has charge of most of the Nation's petroleum activities for war under Secretary Ickes. It seems to me significant that Mr. Davies has been drawing a salary of \$56,000 from Standard of California and at the same time drawing \$8,000 from the Government. He is not a dollar-a-year man; he accepts a Government salary. But also, during all of last year, he continued to draw a salary from the company which has now received this bonanza oil lease from the Roosevelt administration.

Then, working with Mr. Davies, is another important member of Standard Oil of California, Mr. Howard Marshall, its attorney. Mr. Marshall was formerly an attorney for the Office of the Petroleum Administration, in the old N. R. A. days, and prepared an important legal case against Standard Oil of California. Just before that case was to go to trial, he left the Government to join the legal staff of Standard. And now he is back in the Government again, weaving in and out of private industry and Government offices like a shuttlecock, and working with Mr. Davies for the Petroleum Administrator for War.

Another Standard of California official in Washington is Mr. Mark Thornburg, oil adviser to the State Department. Still another interesting figure, who left Washington last week, is Mr. Ed Pauley, who has just resigned as secretary of the Democratic National Committee, but remains its treasurer. Mr. Pauley has been very close to Standard Oil of California in the past. He himself is an oil operator, and some time ago sold out his interest to a subsidiary of Standard of California. He is on intimate terms with Mr. Ralph Davies, and also, of course, he is on intimate terms with the President of the United States.

Now let us examine more carefully what this deal between the Navy and Standard Oil of California involves, by which our priceless oil reserves are given away for a song. This contract between Standard and the Navy was signed on November 18, 1942, by the Secretary of the Navy, Frank Knox. It was a very

hush-hush deal. These oil lands had created more comment, more debate, more discussion, than any others in the world. They were responsible for the resignation of two members of the Harding Cabinet, Albert B. Fall and Edwin Denby. Yet the Navy Department, very quietly, without letting anyone know about it, without even discussing the matter with other members of the Roosevelt Cabinet, signed this contract, rushed it to the White House, and somehow or other got it approved by the President in a single day. Why the President acted in 1 day, only he knows. Other officials have known memoranda and contracts to remain on his desk for weeks. But here was a deal in which the entire Nation was interested, and the subject of which had been the source of great controversy in the past, and which many of our distinguished colleagues had spent weeks and months in protecting.

Yet, after the President signed on November 18, and without waiting for any congressional approval or any congressional appropriation, Standard Oil of California rushed its drills and derricks on to Elk Hills and began drilling for oil. They began on November 20, and already have drilled eight excellent wells.

Meanwhile, the Secretary of the Interior, in charge of Public Lands, who is also the Petroleum Administrator, was not informed regarding this vital contract. Nor was the Justice Department, whose Lands Division is supposed to negotiate contracts regarding public lands, informed of this give-away of the Navy's vital oil resources. The only indication which leaked out at the time was a threadbare and very deceptive statement issued by the Navy on December 11, which stated that—

The Secretary of the Navy has entered into an agreement for acquisition of lands owned by Standard Oil of California in Naval Oil Reserve No. 1 and for operation of the field by Standard.

It will be noted that this Navy announcement states that the Navy has acquired lands owned by Standard Oil of California. Remember that word, in view of the real terms of the contract. The Navy's meager statement goes on to say:

This oil reserve has been enlarged to include all of Elk Hills. By the terms of the agreement the Standard Oil Co. will convey to the Government its 8,330 acres of land. The Navy will compensate Standard for its interest, for the wells and property on the reservation, in the ratio of their respective interests.

The whole tenor of this brief naval announcement gives the impression that the Navy has acquired something, rather than has given it away. However, the press was given no opportunity to review the terms of the contract, nor was the Congress, nor was the Cabinet. Particularly, it is significant that the man who has fought for conservation of oil in the past, Secretary of the Interior Ickes, was not permitted to know anything about the deal.

But, by accident, the Interior Department and the Justice Department heard about the deal, and secured a copy of the

contract. And when they did so they were horrified. For they found, instead of the United States Government acquiring lands, actually the Navy had given away for a period of 5 years all of its carefully preserved oil lands in Elk Hills. And, after the 5 years, two-thirds of the oil goes to Standard Oil of California, while only one-third is returned to the Navy Department. And yet, out of the 43,000 acres, Standard owns only 8,000 acres, or less than one-fourth. In other words, Standard contributes one-fourth of the oil lands—most of them overrun with salt water—and in return for that one-fourth it receives two-thirds of the oil—after the first 5 years. But during that first 5 years, Standard receives all the oil and the Navy receives none.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President—
THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Who pays the cost of development?

Mr. LANGER. There was supposed to be a \$2,000,000 appropriation for that purpose, but the Standard Oil Co. did not wait for that money. The Standard Oil Co. rushed in and drilled wells within 2 days after the contract was signed.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Does the Standard Oil Co. of California participate in the cost of that development program?

Mr. LANGER. The Standard Oil Co. pays for it in its entirety, but that land is all proven land. It is not a wildcat proposition at all; it is all proven territory. It is the outstanding oil field in the world, next to one in Arabia.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to bring to the Senator's attention the fact that that field was laid up to serve the Navy in time of war, and, without knowing any of the facts, it may be that the Navy thought this was the time to release the oil for the war effort.

Mr. LANGER. Then why the secrecy?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I do not know. There may have been a military reason for it.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, Joseph Daniels, Secretary of the Navy during the last war, wrote a letter to Senator La Follette, Sr., some years ago, in which he said:

I remember one night toward the end of a session that Mr. Roosevelt [then Assistant Secretary of the Navy] and I remained at the Capitol all night long, watching the legislation of closing hours fearing that some act might be passed that would turn over these invaluable oil reserves to parties who laid claim to them without even decent shadow of title.

Secretary Daniels was referring to the last war.

But now the shoe is on the other foot and it is the Congress of the United States, not the Navy, which is attempting to preserve the oil reserves of the fleet.

We all remember the day when the Teapot Dome and Elk Hills oil scandals first were brought to light. There was no accusation of graft against the then Secretary of the Navy, Edwin Denby. It was only a charge that he was weak-

kneed. He had bowed to Albert B. Fall. He had permitted the transfer of these oil lands to the Interior Department. And, because of that, Denby resigned.

Since then the oil reserves were transferred from the Interior Department back to the Navy for safekeeping. And now the Nation is faced with another weak-kneed Secretary of the Navy, a Secretary who, without informing the public, signed away this coveted wealth of oil.

Let me review briefly some of the actions of this same Secretary of the Navy and some of the men he has placed in positions of trust around him. I think we all agree that a man is known by the company he keeps and that a high official of the Government is known by the men he chooses for positions of trust near him.

One of the most important speeches ever made by the President of the United States, Mr. Roosevelt, was on March 4, 1933, when, with the banks of the Nation closed, he promised to "drive the money changers out of the temple." That speech thrilled the Nation, and Mr. Roosevelt in the immediate months that followed proceeded to carry out his pledge and did drive the money changers out of the temple.

But now I call your attention to the manner in which the money changers have come back into the temple. Furthermore, they have come back into the temple of our fighting forces, the first line of our national defense, the Navy. Examine the men whom Frank Knox has placed in the key positions in the Navy Department. First, there is the Under Secretary of the Navy, Mr. James Forrestal, former president of Dillon, Read, a banker. Next there is Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Artemus L. Gates, of the New York Trust Co., another banker. Next there is Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Ralph Bard, president of the Chicago Investors Corporation, another banker.

Now I would like to ask what a banker knows about fighting. What does he know about running the Navy? A man who directs the Navy must know what it means to take chances. He must have courage, nerve, daring, intestinal fortitude of the highest quality. But what does a banker know about taking chances? What does a banker know about initiative, technical development, farsightedness, planning?

A banker is trained not to take chances. He is trained to hold back, never to push forward. He is trained to avoid taking risks. His job is to protect his investors, protect his stockholders. The last thing in his line is to cruise out and meet the enemy. He hides behind barred windows, shelters; he is trained to squeeze, to scale down interest, to shave every penny.

What, I ask, is there about the banking business which can contribute to the operation of a great Navy? What is there in the record of Mr. Artemus Gates, as a member of the Greenwich Savings Bank, or the American Surety Co., or the Mercantile Insurance Co., or the North British and Mercantile Insurance Co. which would help him to operate the greatest Navy in the world?

And what is there in the record and experience of Mr. James Forrestal, the Under Secretary of the Navy, as a banker which would qualify him to direct our admirals in the greatest war in history? Is it because he negotiated a loan to Bolivia which precipitated the famous Chaco War between Bolivia and Paraguay? Is that what makes him the good executive to direct a naval war and to give away our oil reserves?

Four weeks ago, when President Penaranda of Bolivia was visiting Washington, the President of the United States, Mr. Roosevelt, actually had to apologize for the loans which the Under Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Forrestal, had forced upon Bolivia. Mr. Roosevelt in press conference stated publicly:

I told the President of Bolivia that I wanted to apologize for the loans we had forced his country to take. Those bonds were sold at such high prices, at a time when nobody in Bolivia wanted the loan anyway, that Bolivia was forced to default. If I have anything to do with it—

Continued the President of the United States—

there will be no more bond selling of that kind in Latin America.

The only company which had sold bonds to Bolivia was Dillon Read, of which James Forrestal, Under Secretary of the Navy, was president. Furthermore, the circumstances under which those bonds were sold were extremely unfortunate. The famous Vickers Arms Co., of England, had sold Bolivia a quantity of arms and ammunition with which Bolivia was building up its army to make war against its neighbor Paraguay. Vickers was unable to collect from Bolivia, so what did Dillon Read under Mr. James Forrestal do? It stepped in and put up the money of American widows, American school teachers, and American orphans, and loaned not merely \$5,000,000 but \$28,000,000 to Bolivia. There were even rumors at the time that the Bolivian Minister of Finance got a cut out of the deal.

Yet, this man, for whom the President of the United States apologized, who forced these war loans on Bolivia, is now sitting at the right hand of Secretary of the Navy Knox, helping to give away our oil lands.

But here is the prize gentleman who directs the destinies of our great Navy, at the right hand of Secretary Knox. He is Joseph W. Powell, who has a very interesting record. In the last war, Mr. Powell was vice president of the Bethlehem Shipbuilding Co., and, as such, built ships for the United States Government under circumstances which have been the subject of very important litigation by the Justice Department. The Justice Department has sued the Bethlehem Shipbuilding Co., and the case went up to the Supreme Court of the United States, which handed down a scathing opinion. Although in that opinion the Court found for the Bethlehem Shipbuilding Co., it did so only because the United States Government had delayed 20 years before bringing suit. However, the most interesting part of the opinion is the Supreme Court's remarks about the special assistant to the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Joseph Powell.

According to Associate Justice Frankfurter and the district court's findings, Mr. Powell was guilty of daylight robbery. The district court, according to Associate Justice Frankfurter, found that Powell "adopted the famous Rob Roy distinction—he admitted he was a robber, but proudly proclaimed that he was no thief."

Associate Justice Frankfurter pointed out that Charles Piez, vice president and general manager of the United States Fleet Corporation, had had no previous shipbuilding experience, and that—

Relations between Powell and Piez were very close. Piez, as Powell knew, had had no shipbuilding experience whatsoever, had implicit confidence in Powell's integrity and shipbuilding ability and experience, and was accustomed to look to him for information and assistance with respect to matters of shipbuilding.

United States shipping authorities attempted to "persuade Powell to undertake the construction upon a lump-sum basis," according to Justice Frankfurter. Powell was adamant, however, and insisted on a contract which cost the Government excess profits of \$26,759,479. Or, as Justice Frankfurter summarizes it—

The estimated costs were almost 29 percent greater than the actual costs. Nowhere in the long record, as the master found, is there any explanation or justification for the tremendous disparity between the estimated costs submitted by Bethlehem, those specified in the contracts, and the actual cost. Bethlehem's profits under these contracts amount to approximately \$24,000,000. * * * Bethlehem took absolutely no risk of loss. In addition, the Government agreed to advance all sums necessary to finance the construction of the vessels. Even in usurious transactions the lender takes the risk of the borrower's insolvency. Here Bethlehem took no risk at all.

That is the kind of a deal which Joseph Powell, the right-hand man of Secretary Knox, put across on the Government in the last war. Yet, despite that fact, he was given a place of confidence, a place of trust, as the personal adviser to the Secretary of the Navy in this war.

Furthermore, Secretary Knox had had occasion to know something about Joseph Powell much more recently. During a recent congressional investigation it was revealed that Mr. Powell had rented an apartment at the Shoreham Hotel and had paid for the expenses of Mr. Anning Prall, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission. At the time, that news caused considerable publicity and much unfavorable criticism. Mr. Powell then was a lobbyist in Washington; and he was charged with using his friend, Mr. Anning Prall, Chairman of the F. C. C., to aid his private business connections.

Yet, despite all those known facts about Mr. Powell, the Secretary of the Navy gave him a position of vital confidence. It is no wonder, when a man has been instrumental in taking \$24,000,000 out of the pockets of the Government in 1917 and 1918, and is trusted by the Secretary of the Navy, that the Secretary of the Navy looks with indifference or even approval on the robbing of our national oil reserves by the Standard Oil Co. of California at this time.

Mr. President, I call the attention of Senators who are opposed to the Farm Security Administration to another kind of deal. Only a few days ago the Senate voted in favor of the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. Under the reciprocal trade agreement in effect with Mexico at the present time we have made an agreement to import from Mexico 700,000 head of cattle at 3 cents a pound. Not satisfied with the millions we have given her under lend-lease, Mexico put an export duty of 1½ cents a pound on those cattle. By that subterfuge we are financing the Mexican Government to the extent of 1½ cents on each pound of cattle so imported. The Mexican peon gets the other 1½ cents a pound for raising the cattle. Our American farmers are asked to raise cattle in competition with cattle selling for 3 cents a pound.

Again, Mr. President, I listened with interest to what the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia had to say about socialism and communism. It happened that on about the same day when President Roosevelt took office, I took office as Governor of the State of North Dakota. The distinguished junior Senator from Virginia says that what transpired in the establishment of the Farm Security Administration and kindred organizations was socialism or communism; to quote him exactly, he said it was following Russian communism.

Mr. President, I believe that when the history of this war is written, and when the historians come to detail to the people of the future the tragic conditions of the farmers of this country in 1933, 1934, 1935, and 1936, the verdict will be that President Roosevelt avoided a revolution in this country. I remember well when, in October 1933, former Senator Herring called a conference of Governors of 11 farm States. At that time we went to Des Moines, Iowa. Outside the territory of North Dakota, into Minnesota, into Nebraska, into Kansas, and into Iowa, wherever one went, the farmers were on strike. They were tipping over automobiles containing cream cans. In the State of the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHEAT], we found that the first night we were in Lincoln, a man was killed a few miles south of the town. Governor Bryan, who had a brother-in-law down there, sent for him because, he said, revolution was breaking out in the State of Nebraska.

In the great State of Iowa—I note that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is present, and he will bear me out—in October 1933 the farmers burned or dynamited every bridge leading into Sioux Falls, Iowa. At the Governors' conference, five Governors, of whom I was one, were selected to come to Washington.

I well remember that when we walked into the Office of the President of the United States, there was Leo Crowley. He had in his hand six telegrams from six different cities in the State of Wisconsin. Three of the telegrams told how creameries had been blown up or burned down. In three other cases the farmers had put coal oil into the churns and vats to wreck the creameries. That was all brought to the attention of the

President. It was then, and only then, when the President saw the desperate situation which was facing the farmers of the country, with rye selling at 7 cents a bushel, wheat at 24 cents a bushel, corn at 13 to 15 cents a bushel, and eggs at 3 to 4 cents a dozen, that the President took the action which I shall describe in a few moments.

What was the situation in my own State? I have in my hand a report, not made to me when I was Governor, but made to my successor in office, Governor Moses, after I left the Governor's office, after we had had one good crop.

In Rolette County there were 997 farmers. Fifty-seven were self-supporting; 138 were partly self-supporting; 241 were dependent; 246 were renters; and 315 farmers had no roof over their heads. They were squatting, going from one place to another, trying to find somewhere to live.

It was at that time that the Farm Security Administration came along and gave those poor people \$346,000. The administration gave it to them because they needed it.

Take the Indian reservations. It has been stated on this floor that other agencies will lend money to those poor people. I was the Governor of North Dakota. We have Indian reservations in my State. Many of those Indians have farmed for years. They are men of good reputation and character. Does anyone suppose that those Indians could get a single bank to make them a loan? The banks would not make loans at the Standing Rock Reservation near the home of my distinguished friend, the Senator from South Dakota. They would not lend a dollar. They would not lend a dollar to the Indians on the Elbow Woods Reservation. So I telephoned to John Collier and told him the desperate situation, and John Collier sent \$12,000 by telegraph. A few days later we needed more money, and again he sent it by telegraph. Time and time again John Collier sent money there to keep those Indians from starving to death.

Finally, after much persuasion, we induced the Farm Security Administration to make 12 loans, 6 to the Indians of the Standing Rock Reservation, and 6 to the Indians at Elbow Woods.

What does the record show? It shows that those Indians paid back their loans better than the average white man did; and yet today if we take away the Farm Security Administration, I do not know of a single place where those thousands of Indians will be able to go to obtain a loan. The same thing is true of the renters in various parts of the State of North Dakota.

I was interested in what the distinguished Senator from North Carolina had to say 2 or 3 days ago. That brings me to the subject of prostitution. I now quote from Federal Probation, a quarterly journal of correctional philosophy and practice, published by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts in cooperation with the Bureau of Prisons of the Department of Justice, Washington, D. C. I ask the distinguished Senator from Virginia and the distinguished Senator from North Carolina where the prostitutes around camps are

coming from. I have before me an article by Helen Hironimus, warden of the Federal Reformatory for Women, at Alderson, W. Va. What does she say? Let me read:

SURVEY OF 100 MAY ACT VIOLATORS COMMITTED TO THE FEDERAL REFORMATORY FOR WOMEN

(By Helen Hironimus, warden, Federal Reformatory for Women, Alderson, W. Va.)

The word "prostitute" brings to mind the picture of a person somewhat different from anyone included in this survey. The popular conception is that of a flashily dressed, gay, and reckless young woman with a certain amount of sophistication.

Recent articles lead one to believe that a prostitute from a camp area might be a homesick, bewildered young girl who left her home in a distant State expecting to marry her soldier sweetheart but found him departed from camp and herself stranded.

We expected to receive both these types of young women as violators of the May Act, but instead there are very few who answer either description. When the United States marshals began depositing the undernourished, dejected, and bedraggled young girls and women on our doorstep we realized that we were in error. With only six exceptions, they have come from submarginal, industrial, and agricultural areas. Under ordinary circumstances most of them would have spent their lives in poverty and obscurity, but the world upheaval has changed their destinies. They were ill-equipped for the rapid whirl of soldiers, easy money, beer taverns, and freedom from drudgery, drabness, and monotony. The six exceptions are young girls who followed sweethearts or husbands to camp and resorted to prostitution when their funds were exhausted.

ANALYSIS OF THE FIRST 100 CASES

The cases included in this survey are those of the first 100 women committed to the Alderson institution for violation of the May Act. To date the statute has been invoked in two military areas surrounding Fort Bragg, N. C., and Camp Forrest, Tenn., and the cases were received from the Federal district courts in the eastern district of Tennessee and the eastern and middle districts of North Carolina.

Race: Included in the group are 68 white offenders, 20 Negroes, and 12 Croatian Indians. The latter are all residents of an Indian settlement in North Carolina.

Period of commitment: Seventy-three of the women were committed for periods of from 10 to 12 months; 21, to 6 months; and 6, to periods of 3 to 4 months.

Age: The women ranged in age from 15 to 65, but, as might be anticipated, younger women constituted the largest portion of the group. Only 10 were above the age of 35.

TABLE I.—Age distribution of 100 women violators of the May Act

Age:	
Under 18.....	12
18 to 20.....	25
21 to 25.....	31
26 to 35.....	22
36 to 45.....	6
Over 45.....	4
All cases.....	100

TABLE II.—Educational attainment of 100 women violators of the May Act

Educational attainment:	
No school attendance.....	15
Less than 6th grade.....	25
6th grade.....	27
8th grade.....	25
Entered high school.....	7
Completed high school.....	1
All cases.....	100

¹ United States Code, title 18, section 518a.

TABLE III.—Intelligence classification of 100 women violators of the May Act

Classification:	
Imbecile (I. Q. under 50).....	8
Moron (I. Q. 50-69).....	57
Borderline (I. Q. 70-79).....	11
Dull normal (I. Q. 80-89).....	16
Normal (I. Q. 90-110).....	8

All cases¹..... 100

¹ Average I. Q. for all cases is 67.7 (moron).

Educational achievement and intelligence level: The educational attainment of the 100 May Act violators, as indicated in table II, is quite low. The low level of achievement is explained in part by the restricted educational facilities and the limited opportunities for academic instruction in the areas in which most of the women have lived. Also significant in this connection are the results of standardized intelligence tests administered to the group (see table III). The school achievement claimed was belied by the fact that many of the women who had indicated completion of the fifth grade were found to be completely illiterate. A variety of explanations was given by the women for their limited school achievement; lack of suitable clothing or funds for books, inability to progress, irregularity of attendance, need for assistance in the home were among the most frequent.

Family and environmental background: A review of the family and environmental backgrounds of the group provides conclusive evidence that few of the women are of the sophisticated urban type. Nearly all were reared in rural areas or in small towns, and only nine in cities. Although half of the group came from farm homes, all but six were those of sharecroppers or tenant farmers. The parents of but eight were skilled workers and only one parent had professional status.

While it is difficult to establish with certainty the economic level of the homes, the facts available indicate that 67 came from submarginal homes, 27 from marginal, 2 from fair, and 4 from good homes.

The social histories are replete with recitals of domestic difficulties in the parental background. Forty-three came from broken homes, and in many of these, as well as in the other cases, delinquency, alcoholism, neglect, and cruelty were common. Other homes, while not vicious, were inadequate because of physical disability of the parents, or the absence of constructive discipline. In many instances the mother is reported to have been sexually promiscuous, cohabiting with various men and rearing illegitimate children in the home.

Marital status: The unsettled character of the environment, the limited educational background, and the restricted mental capacities of the group have their reflection in the adjustments made by the women in their various communities.

Of the 53 women who had married, 31 were reported to have been separated or divorced. That several of the group were sexually promiscuous is evidenced by the fact that a total of 31 illegitimate children are listed in the case histories, while 2 other offenders are presently pregnant with paternity unknown.

Employment history: Work histories are extremely limited and of slight consequence. Six women had histories of employment in textile mills or in laundries, 3 had worked on farms, 18 as domestics. An additional 15 claimed experience as waitresses, but for the most part this represented employment in taverns, tourist camps, dance halls, and the like.

Arrest record: That some members of the group already were known to the police and the courts is not altogether surprising. The fingerprint reports of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and other official records revealed that 64 of the offenders had been arrested previously. The majority of the prior

arrests were not for serious law violations, arrests for misdemeanors were predominant. Charges of assault, disorderly conduct, drunkenness, solicitation, prostitution, and vagrancy account for more than two-thirds of the total number of arrests reported for the group. The justifiable inference from these records is that the delinquent activities of the group have been restricted to relatively minor law violations and that the number of habitual or professional offenders was very small.

History of prostitution: While it was clear from the arrest records that several of the women were involved in delinquencies when quite young, it was found quite difficult to establish with any degree of accuracy the length of time that any individual had been involved in prostitution or the age at which prostitution had begun. Sexual promiscuity, in many instances, dated to adolescence apparently as a consequence of the low moral standards of the homes and limited parental discipline. In few cases there is evidence of a history of professional prostitution for a considerable period, but for the most part, participation in sex activities on a commercial basis had its beginnings with the construction of military camps in the areas of residence. From the case histories and from interviews one is convinced, moreover, that there are a large number of the women who cannot be classified as prostitutes, but who are occasionally sexually promiscuous and whose activities would have escaped the attention of law-enforcement agents had their companions not been soldiers.

Use of alcohol and drugs: Almost without exception, the women who became sexually promiscuous when over 30 condone their actions on the grounds that they drank excessively. This reason also is given by a number of younger women. Only 9 of the women claimed abstinence from the use of alcohol, 35 reported themselves moderate or occasional drinkers, and 56 indicated excessive drinking. Of the latter group, 23 reported extended histories of alcoholism. None of the May Act violators committed to date has been found to be addicted to the use of narcotics. The excessive use of alcohol may well be symptomatic of fundamental problems of a psychological nature.

Other factors undoubtedly contributed to these delinquencies. Again the inadequacies of the community environment cannot be overlooked, but the precipitating condition was undoubtedly the introduction to the areas of large numbers of men having limited resources for amusement and relatively large amounts of money to spend. As one young girl expressed it, "There was more money and more men than we had ever seen, and we lost our heads."

Methods of operation: Further evidence of the fact that the activities of the violators were more or less spontaneous results of the impact of the war situation upon their individual lives is gained from the investigation of the character of the relationships. There is little indication that the activities were organized. The usual well-developed pattern of procurers, "madams," and brothels is nowhere in evidence. Only 24 of the women operated in houses. As a rule these women were members of small groups which lived together but solicited independently of each other. Five operated in hotels, two in tourist cabins, and one in a trailer. The remainder resorted to chance acquaintances and pickups and utilized cars, taxis, empty buildings, rented rooms, barns, and fields.

Earnings from prostitution: The earnings of the women varied and fluctuated from time to time. The Indian women denied the acceptance of money in any instance, explaining that this would be a sin. Ordinarily, when the soldiers had considerable money

they were generous and a fee as high as \$5 might be obtained. Sixty-eight of the women reported accepting whatever could be secured, never more than \$5, occasionally nothing; seven reported fees from \$3 to \$5; four from \$1 to \$3; four, \$1 or less; and five, lodging, food, and drink only.

THE TREATMENT PROGRAM

Further elaboration upon the statistical material would not appear to be indicated. The "typical" picture presented by the violators thus far received is that of a young woman in her early twenties, undernourished, with scanty, cheap, untidy clothing, the product of an insecure and unstable rural existence. Ordinarily, she is rather inarticulate and bewildered at finding herself in unfamiliar surroundings far from home, confined for doing something which she considered her own personal affair. What the picture might be if the provisions of the May Act were extended to other camp areas is, of course, problematical. Undoubtedly, if its provisions were put into effect in urban areas, a more heterogeneous group presenting wider individual differences would be committed. Our present sample, from this point of view, is probably quite typical but its homogeneity unquestionably reduces the number of treatment problems presented.

The relatively short periods of commitment and the fact that the offense constitutes a misdemeanor are the limiting factors in the development of treatment programs at the institution. It is difficult for the staff to formulate plans which will meet all of the needs of the various individuals in view of the short time available for treatment. Moreover, since the women are not legally eligible for parole or conditional release, they are denied the opportunity of receiving constructive supervision upon return to the community.

This is not to say, however, that nothing can be done for this group of offenders during their stay at Alderson. On the contrary, they receive many benefits. When these women were admitted to the institution, medical examinations revealed a wide variety of physical needs. Forty were in need of antiluetic treatment, and 4 required attention for gonorrhea. The relatively low rate of venereal disease may be further indication of the limited sex experience of some of the girls. Generally speaking, all were undernourished, and in only 24 cases had any of the offenders previously received dental attention. Of the remaining group, 37 were urgently in need of extensive dental treatment. Three serious eye conditions were noted, 7 tonsillectomies recommended, and 47 refractions for glasses. Four women suffered from pelvic defects and surgical treatment was indicated.

That other, though somewhat less tangible, benefits were derived, was apparent from the initial period of quarantine to the final process of release. It was a new world of sanitation, clinics, activities, and opportunity for them, and it was interesting to see their development. Marked changes in attitude were evidenced; and the personal appearances of the inmates were greatly improved with the increased knowledge of personal hygiene. So extensive were the changes that in many instances it became difficult to recognize the women. They appeared more youthful and self-assured.

Despite the difficulties in release planning, every effort has been made to prepare the offenders for their return to the community. For the women who will return to textile industrial centers, instruction in the use of power machines in the garment shop has been provided. Others have received training in the institution dining rooms and kitchens so that they will be able to accept

positions as domestics, waitresses, and cooks in areas where critical shortages exist. Still others have received instruction in farming.

CONCLUSIONS

After release from the institution some will have other conflicts with the law, but it must be remembered that in addition to their own personal deficiencies some of the women must face almost insurmountable difficulties. There has been an inadequate period of treatment and training and there is no supervision after return to the community. If some fail, others will succeed, and all of them have benefited to some extent by the opportunities offered to them. Although the sentences are of short duration it is better that they were committed here than retained in jails. Sanitation and personal hygiene have been substituted for disease, filth, and vermin; and constructive training has taken the place of idleness.

We know exactly where the prostitutes are coming from. I have before me testimony given before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, of which subcommittee the distinguished junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. ARKEN] was chairman. This is the statement of Donald E. Montgomery, consumers' counsel of the United Automobile, Aircraft, and Agricultural Implement Workers. This is his sworn testimony. He says:

Here they are in a few dashes of brutal statistics just off the Government press:

A. Forty-six million Americans living on cash incomes in 1942 below the \$1,500 level.

B. Twenty-seven million of these living below the \$1,000 level, and spending, as a whole, more than they took in as cash income during 1942.

C. Over 11,000,000 families whose annual cash expenditure for food was, at best, about \$530 a year, or about 50 cents for each family meal, and was on the average only \$350 a year, or about 35 cents a meal for the family. Many of these 11,000,000 fared even worse.

The conscience coordinator would program the steps necessary to see that the elemental needs of these people are met. He would recommend, undoubtedly, that the food stamp plan or its equivalent be put back to work, not on a surplus basis but on a need basis. It need not subsidize voluntary idleness, but neither need it tolerate involuntary hunger. In addition to the unemployed and unemployable, it would have to help buy food for many families who are described as fully employed, including some whose breadwinner is on a Federal, State, or local pay roll, especially janitors, charwomen, clerks, and school teachers.

He should develop also plans for preferential rationing of the cheaper types of foods for these low income families. Under a shortage of food, people of means turn to the use of foods which usually are left to the meager tables of low-income families. Rationing gives the well-to-do a claim on their share of cheap foods, but of course takes no steps to bring expensive foods within the reach of low-income families. Preferential rations of the economy types of food for these families would give them some protection.

Mr. President, I shall not make any invidious comparisons. I have before me the record showing the profits made by the corporations of this country during 1941 and 1942. Take, for example, agricultural machinery, the very machinery which these men and women

must buy. The distinguished Senator from Virginia says that this program is collective farming, communism, and socialism. I have read the record, showing that some of those people have only 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, or 10 acres. Would the Senator have a man farming 10 or 20 acres, or even 80 or 160 acres, buy a great quantity of expensive farm machinery?

Is it not good sense on the part of the Government to organize a cooperative of 8, 10, or 15 farmers to enable them to get together and seed and harvest their crops? What do we find? We find that in 1941, and 1942, the profits of agricultural machinery manufacturers rose 211 percent.

Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a table entitled "Appendix C," showing the percentage change in profits after taxes, 1939-41, arranged by industrial groups, for 1,716 large industrial corporations, and ask that that part of the article appearing on page 5 of the United Dairy Farmer for April 15, 1943, dealing with the Office of Price Administration studies of manufacturers and merchants, showing the profits for the first 3 months of 1942, also be inserted.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Every group of manufacturers or merchants whose earnings are reported by the Office of Price Administration studies as increased at all above earnings for 1939, is a group taking undue profit out of the pocket of the middle- and lower-income groups of wage earners. To claim that the corporations' increased profits come from larger volume of business is no justification; because, if true, then logically, so long as the average worker's earnings have not been increased to a living wage, the profiting corporations should reduce their prices on account of their increased volume of business, so that their earnings would remain on the same level as those of the worker; i. e., to the 1939 level, when the war started.

Instead of this, what do we have? We have, by the quotation above and by further reference to volume No. 1, table I, the news that 156 corporations engaged in trade (wholesale, retail, etc.) increased their earnings from 1939 to 1941 by 72.9 percent. In dollars these 156 corporations took in the sum of \$493,730,000 in the single year 1941.

And we have 131 food corporations increasing their earnings in that same period by 62.4 percent, taking in \$361,908,000 in 1941. The increase in net profits alone of these two groups who deal with the very essentials of life for American workers was \$347,000,000 for 1941 above 1939 net profits.

Added to this are the further increases in rate of profit that these corporations have obtained since 1941. Quoting the Office of Price Administration again.

Volume No. 4, page 1: "Profits before income taxes in 1942 are continuing to rise substantially above the high levels of 1941. * * * It is estimated, therefore, that 1942 profits of all manufacturing industries will show about a 40-percent rise over the 1941 level."

WAGES MUST RISE

Even if excess-profits taxes at last should catch up with this increased rate of earnings, it will be the ultimate consuming public who will be paying the corporation taxes. The corporations are not being asked to reduce their assets in any way to help pay for the war. So again the public, the man who works for a wage, must get a raise in his pay, and quickly.

Percentage change in profits after taxes, 1939-41, arranged by industrial groups (1,716 large industrial corporations)

Industrial group	Number of companies	Percentage change 1939-41
Total of groups.....	1,716	55
Durable goods:		
Aircraft and parts.....	30	338
Lumber products.....	23	283
Railway equipment.....	26	255
Agricultural machinery.....	8	211
Shipbuilding.....	8	165
Iron and steel.....	84	146
Industrial machinery, nonelectrical.....	120	127
Miscellaneous machinery.....	28	126
Building machinery and equipment.....	31	97
Nonferrous metal products.....	27	96
Building construction.....	11	81
Miscellaneous metal products.....	49	81
Automobile parts and accessories.....	74	72
Business machinery.....	15	63
Copper mining and smelting.....	17	60
Electrical industrial machinery.....	31	58
Building materials and supplies.....	65	49
Household appliances.....	42	37
Automobiles.....	20	35
Furnishing, nonbusiness.....	16	29
Nonferrous mining and smelting, excluding copper.....	25	9
Nondurable goods:		
Paper and products.....	72	135
Textile fabrics.....	62	120
Meat packing.....	16	88
Rubber products.....	27	80
Sugar.....	74	74
Petroleum.....	79	65
Miscellaneous textiles.....	9	58
Textile apparel.....	38	47
Leather and shoes.....	24	44
Paints and varnishes.....	13	43
Miscellaneous.....	36	32
Printing and publishing.....	41	25
Alcoholic beverages.....	36	18
Industrial chemicals.....	35	18
Other chemicals.....	15	16
Miscellaneous food products.....	45	14
Nonalcoholic beverages.....	13	14
Drugs, soaps, and medicines.....	26	5
Dairy products.....	16	4
Containers, excluding paper.....	12	3
Tobacco products.....	22	7
Baking and grain processing.....	28	15
Trade:		
Wholesale trade.....	22	56
Retail foods.....	23	17
Miscellaneous retail.....	105	16
Mail order.....	6	7
Services:		
Transportation services.....	42	143
Amusements.....	22	47
Miscellaneous services.....	45	21

NOTE.—Coal-mining group omitted because of a deficit in 1939. In 1941, profits of this group increased 92.5 percent over 1940.

Compare these percentage changes in profits of corporations after taxes of up to 338 percent with the Little Steel wage formula of 15 percent "or labor."

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, this exhibit shows that no matter in what business people have been engaged, whether the manufacture of food, farm machinery, or textile goods, the profits have gone up. However, we still find 11,000,000 families trying to serve themselves a meal at a cost of 35 cents for the entire family.

Reverting again to the speech delivered by the distinguished junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken] I invite attention to the enormous profits which were made by the shipbuilders. It will be remembered that by a vote of every Member of the Senate except five, the Senate said that was all right. Only five of us voted against it. Referring to the figures put in the RECORD by the distinguished junior Senator from Vermont, I read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 21, 1943, at page 285. In the

House of Representatives Representative CULKIN said:

My attention has also been called to the fact that this same company, operating a number of ships through the Red Sea on voyages between October 1941 and June 1942, made profits amounting to some \$3,342,000. These were single trips, and the net book value of these boats whose earnings on single trips was in excess of \$3,000,000 was \$800,000. This procedure, to my mind, smells to heaven, and every phase of it should be ruthlessly investigated and exposed.

Then the distinguished Representative inserted in the RECORD a statement showing the names of the ships and the trips which were taken.

We also have a report from Mr. Lindsay C. Warren, Comptroller General, showing how another corporation organized with a capital of \$500 ran it into a profit of nearly \$3,000,000.

Mr. President, there has not been any criticism of that on the floor of the Senate. There was not any criticism the other day. When the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] said that we were giving back nearly eight or nine billion dollars under the so-called Rumml plan, there was no objection whatever. Some said it was not forgiveness. I shall not now argue that question. My vote showed what I thought about the entire transaction; but the fact nevertheless remains that this morning's newspaper carried an interview with the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] in which he was quoted as saying that he did not know where the \$35,000,000,000 which we must raise in taxes by January 1 is to come from.

Mr. President, to return to the Farm Security Administration, to sum up, I said a few moments ago that the merchants in North Dakota in overwhelming numbers, the chambers of commerce in practically every large city in the State, and thousands of the very best farmers in North Dakota say the F. S. A. has been the salvation of the State of North Dakota. I have the petition and the letters with me, and will be glad to have any Senator examine them.

In 1932 in North Dakota we had no crop. In 1933 we had no crop; in 1934 we had no crop; in 1935 we had no crop; in 1936 we had no crop; we had a small crop in 1937, and a poor crop again in 1938. We had fine, honest-to-God farmers out there who seeded 640 acres and never threshed 1 bushel. They depended on the F. S. A. and other Government agencies to help them. They did not leave the farms. They stayed there. As the President said in his letter to Mr. Patton, which I have already placed in the RECORD, they increased the food yield tremendously. They are out there now depending on the Senate to maintain the F. S. A. and other kindred organizations in force.

I wish only that Senators who want to abolish the F. S. A. could see farms such as we have in the great Northwest, where year after year there was no crop, where grasshoppers, rust, drought, and hail took the crop away in its entirety, and yet the farmers with their wives and children stayed there and tried to eke out a living.

They had no one to depend upon but the President of the United States and the Congress to see that they did not starve. I wish Senators had been there at that time. If they had been there they would not now be asking that the F. S. A. be eliminated.

Mr. DANAHER obtained the floor.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, notice has been served that a final vote upon the pending bill must be reached before we adjourn. With the progress we have made, the Senate is likely to be in session until quite late this evening. Would the Senator from Connecticut object to having a quorum call so that I may submit a request for a limitation upon debate in connection with the pending bill?

Mr. DANAHER. I will not object to such a request, Mr. President. I hope that I may obtain recognition for about 5 minutes. I will say to the Senator from Georgia that my purpose in rising is to explain briefly for the RECORD my reasons for being unwilling to sign the conference report on Senate bill 796.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have no desire to object to the Senator presenting his statement.

Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Is it necessary to have a quorum call before a request may be made for limitation upon debate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The only time a quorum is required under the rules is when a request is made to fix the time for a final vote.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that in the further consideration of this bill no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 15 minutes on any amendment, and on the bill. I may say that I have discussed the proposal with both the acting majority leader and the minority leader. The agreement, if entered into, will, of course, allow a 30-minute continuous speech to any Senator on any amendment and the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request submitted by the Senator from Georgia? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from Connecticut.

PREVENTION OF STRIKES IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, as one of the Senate conferees on Senate bill 796, commonly known as the Connally bill, I found myself after several days of deadlocked discussion at odds with my colleagues on what seemed to me to be fundamental changes in the bill as it had left the Senate and which at that time had my complete support.

I might modify the word "complete" in the sense that I was by no means in accord with what seemed to me to be the extremity of the criminal penalties which were provided in the section known as section 4 of the bill, and yet I recognized that, in order to achieve the main objec-

tive upon which the Senate was in substantial agreement, it was necessary that one yield his own individual views as to a particular section, in this case, section 4. We cannot have everything the way we want it.

However, Mr. President, when the bill reached the House of Representatives marked changes were made, and when the House amendments came before the conferees for consideration, it became perfectly obvious that the philosophy of the Senate bill would be completely thwarted if the House language were to prevail. Although every one of the conferees sought to reconcile his respective differences, and much helpful progress was made over a period of several days, I found myself unable to agree on the bill as finally agreed upon in conference, in that the character of the bill has been fundamentally altered from the form in which it passed the Senate. Under the Senate version the lack of a definition of the term "labor disturbance," for example, which might give rise to authority for the President to seize a plant producing any article which may be useful for the war effort, placed the first section on tenuous ground, at best, but protections were afforded to all parties under the language of section 6.

I might point out that section 6 of the Senate bill provided that the United States Conciliation Service might certify a labor dispute to the War Labor Board, and, moreover, that the War Labor Board, for its own part, might take jurisdiction of a labor dispute whenever the Board found that the labor dispute had become so serious that it might lead to substantial interference with the war effort. Moreover, Mr. President, we had implemented the functions of the Board by permitting it to issue subpoenas in order to bring the parties before it and to command the production of documents, and, although we limited the Board somewhat by requiring that its decisions must conform to the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 and the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, the decisions, though final, were subject to review by the courts as to questions of law.

Mr. President, a review of such decisions is an inherent right, it has seemed to many of us; it is one which the Senate had interpolated into the bill by way of amendment on the floor. We felt that if the National War Labor Board, which up to this time had been functioning under Executive order, were to be given statutory status, if its decisions were to be final, in the absence of review, we would, indeed, be ascribing to it a most serious grant of authority. So, Mr. President, the Senate was in overwhelming accord, let me say, that the decision of the Board was to be final, except insofar as it was subject to review on questions of law. The conferees have eliminated that provision from the bill. In my judgment, it is a serious error, and since it goes right to the heart of the matter, it is sufficient, indeed, to cause all other points of dispute to take on unusual emphasis.

In the event of a labor dispute and before a strike and before plant seizure,

at least, the jurisdiction which we conferred on the Board by section 6 could be invoked, and its decision was "subject to review by the court on questions of law." The action of the conferees in eliminating provision for review not only revives but gives fresh impetus to the natural fears of possible abuse of the authorization. For example, in a plant employing many thousands, a dozen men, in combination, might provoke such a "labor disturbance," a term which as yet lacks definition, as to purport to justify a seizure, and men of design might easily so act in key plants or in key positions in a war industry. When the President seized the North American Aviation plant in June 1941, Attorney General Jackson, now Mr. Justice Jackson of the Supreme Court, handed down an opinion authorizing the President's action. He wrote:

The distinction between loyal labor leaders and those who are following the Communist Party line is easy to observe. Loyal labor leaders fight for a settlement of labor grievances. Disloyal men who have wormed their way into the labor movement do not want settlements—they want strikes. That is the Communist Party line which those who have defied both the Government and their own leaders to prevent a settlement of the strike have followed.

What Mr. Jackson then said is entirely true now, with this difference, that he was writing of a labor movement in terms of organized labor, whereas there is no such reference in this bill, and the labor disturbance may emanate from groups who hold no membership whatever in organized labor.

Again, Mr. President, under section 4 (a) of the Senate version of the bill, after the Government had taken possession of a plant it became unlawful for any person to coerce, instigate, or induce another to strike. The conferees have amended that language to cause it to reach, in addition, persons who conspire with or encourage any person to strike, under serious criminal penalties. Obviously for citizens generally or third parties, to coerce, instigate, or induce a strike against a Government agency operating a seized plant is one thing; an agreement among men who are actual employees of such a plant is a very different thing, and places this section, it seems to me, on an untenable basis in the light of the general provisions of law contained in the National Labor Relations Act, which recognizes the right of labor to organize and, also, to strike.

Again, Mr. President, it should be emphasized that the conferees, by encompassing the War Labor Board with requirements for conformity to the National Labor Relations Act may produce endless confusion, particularly since by depriving parties of an opportunity to seek a review on questions of law, the War Labor Board is given statutory status in making binding official decisions. Hitherto the Board, acting under Executive order, has itself considered its decisions merely advisory. They will now be final, with the result that the War Labor Board is given an over-riding power actually to write every contract of employment from one end of the coun-

try to the other in all instances covered by this particular legislation.

Turning to the conference report, I might point out that the first section gives the act a new title. The second section deals with definitions.

The third deals with the basis upon which the President may seize a plant, and it provides that—

Whenever there be an interruption in the production of an article which may be useful in the war effort if the President finds and proclaims that that interruption is due to a strike or other labor disturbance and that the war effort will be unduly impeded or delayed by such interruption and that the exercise of such power and authority is necessary to insure the operation of the plant in the interest of the war effort—

He may seize it.

Mr. President, assume a state of facts in which terms and conditions of employment have become so obnoxious that men have calculated their situation and have decided to strike. Instead of finding remedy for the grievances which have led to the strike, section 4 of the conference version would freeze those conditions and preserve the status quo. No remedy whatever is provided once the Government seizes the plant other than under section 5 of the proposed act, and under section 5 a majority of the employees will be required to join in application to the National War Labor Board for a change of such conditions.

Curiously any order the Board enters up pursuant to that application shall upon approval by the President be complied with by the Government agency operating the plant, mine, or facility. There is not one word, in terms, about its binding either the employer or the employees; it binds merely the agency of the Government which is operating it.

I particularly stated that there was no obligation "in terms" binding upon the employees; but there are sanctions imposed by operation of the other sections of the act proposed. Under section 6, once the Government has seized a plant, anyone who conspires with one of his fellows to strike, or one who instigates or induces or encourages another to strike, becomes subject to a penalty of not more than \$5,000 fine or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

Under section 8 of the proposed act there is a provision which has been imported into the measure from the House language of such nature that while under the first subsection of section 8 notice is required to be given to the Secretary of Labor, the War Labor Board, and the National Labor Relations Board that a labor dispute has arisen, under subsection 2 the employees and the employer must continue production for a period of 30 days; and if at the end of that 30 days an election be taken, as the act requires, by the National Labor Relations Board, which results in a strike vote, then there will obviously be an interruption of production in the plant, whereupon the remedy of the Government is to seize the plant.

Therefore, Mr. President, all those employees who felt themselves aggrieved, gave notice of the labor dispute, took their 30 days' waiting period, continued

in the plant uninterruptedly, and thereafter voted to strike, find that they have voted themselves into that state and condition whereby the Government seizes the plant and the men become liable to criminal prosecution if thereafter they strike. It is an unusual situation, to say the least.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I merely desire to be sure I understood the Senator correctly. He did not mean to say that the men would become liable to criminal prosecution except in a case where the plant was actually under the operation and possession of the Government?

Mr. DANAHER. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. HATCH. That is the only case in which the criminal penalties apply.

Mr. DANAHER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HATCH. I misunderstood the Senator, and was afraid others would.

Mr. DANAHER. It is possible the Senator from New Mexico did misunderstand, it is possible I misstated the fact, as I am speaking extemporaneously.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair calls the attention of the Senator from Connecticut to the fact that he has exhausted his 15 minutes on the amendment.

Mr. DANAHER. I have 15 minutes on the bill, have I not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 15 minutes on the bill.

Mr. DANAHER. I will take my 15 minutes on the bill.

Let me clarify the point the Senator from New Mexico makes, because I am under no misapprehension about the effect of the provision, and I am sure we are both in accord on the point.

Mr. HATCH. I was sure the Senator was not under a misapprehension, but I was afraid his words would be misunderstood. I hope he will clarify them.

Mr. DANAHER. I will clarify them beyond peradventure, I hope. What I hope I will be understood as saying is that if the men decide and vote that they wish to strike, and actually go out on strike, there is nothing in the proposed act which will compel them to go back to work. But if the Government seizes the plant on the ground that there has been an interruption due to the strike, and under a Government agency, operations are resumed in the plant, then such employees will become liable to the criminal provisions should they later strike. Is not that a completely correct statement?

Mr. HATCH. I wanted to be sure it was understood the criminal provisions did not apply until the Government actually had taken possession of the plant.

Mr. DANAHER. That is correct, the Senator from New Mexico and I are in accord.

One other section impels present comment. Section 9, also brought over from

the House, is a provision amending the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, to say that no labor organization shall make a contribution in connection with any election in which a Presidential or Vice Presidential elector or a Senator or Representative in Congress, and so on, is involved.

Curiously, no provision is made to operate against management groups; there is no provision which would forbid manufacturers' associations, if you please, from making political contributions. The amendment applies only against a labor organization.

Mr. President, having mentioned some of the collateral points, I wish to revert for a moment to section 7, which after all is one of the most important features of the bill.

I hope I have made it apparent to everyone that the emphasis, as the proposed act stands now, is in the direction of enforcing seizure of these plants by the United States. Every single proposed remedy, every single penalty, is in the direction of driving the Government to seizure of the plants. What we had hoped to accomplish under section 7 of the Senate language was to make available to the employees a mechanism through which they might procure conciliation or adjudication of their dispute, whatever it might be, and rectification of the terms and conditions of employment, if they required modification or amendment. It operated in favor, not of forcing seizure but of amelioration of conditions in a plant, and the Board was given power to act sua sponte, or on the application of the Conciliation Service.

Mr. President, the conference has stricken out those highly remedial, highly effective means of achieving a modification and correction of the difficulties which lead to a strike, and completely eliminated them with reference to any plant where the Government has actually made a seizure. In other words, if the plant is in operation producing war materials and there be a dispute of such nature that the Conciliation Service certifies it to the War Labor Board, jurisdiction may be had under section 7. Also, as an alternative, if the War Labor Board believes that the labor dispute is so serious that it would lead to interruption, the War Labor Board may take jurisdiction. But neither of those sections will apply if the Government actually has seized a plant, under the conference language. The result is that in any case where a Government seizure has been effectuated, the employees who were disgruntled in the first place, who were on strike because, let us assume, of obnoxious terms and conditions, now find themselves frozen in status quo, the cause of the dispute continues with no remedy whatever, unless a majority of the employees in the plant petition the War Labor Board for a rectification of conditions. Even then, whatever the decision of the War Labor Board shall be, it becomes final, because the men cannot strike without leaving themselves possibly answerable to the criminal penalties of section 6.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is it not true that under the bill even in the case of plants taken over by the Government whenever a majority of the employees desire to ask for different wages or different working conditions they have the right to apply to the War Labor Board?

Mr. DANAHER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. Would the Senator advocate that that should be done by a minority? The Senator seemed to make a great point of the fact that it took a majority to do it. I thought this was a majority country, and unless a majority of the employees asked for it, I do not see any reason why they should be given it. The Senator also must remember that under the criminal penalties for striking, under the Government operation, there is a specific clause which provides that no man shall be guilty of any offense under that section for quitting work, and doing no more. He is not guilty of anything then. But if he goes around and encourages or incites or conspires with other men, then he is guilty; is that right?

Mr. DANAHER. That is what it says. I do not say that it is right, but that is what it says.

Mr. CONNALLY. I beg the literary Senator's pardon. I should have said "correct", not "right."

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I will simply observe by way of reply to the Senator from Texas that in a war industry there may be 2,000 men employed, and only 24 machine-tool makers. The 24 machine-tool makers may be the very heart of that industry. Their grievance may be a very just one, a very complete one. They may even belong to a craft union which is in no way affiliated with a union which has the bargaining powers in a particular plant. It may in other words result, Mr. President, that a group of employees in a given plant will not be in position to secure redress from their Government of the conditions which were so obnoxious in the first place as to have forced the strike which led to the plant seizure.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the situation is so anomalous and so completely at variance with the genius of the Senate bill, that it is unfortunate, as I see it, that the matter has taken the turn to which I have adverted. I have simply stated my reasons for disagreeing action with reference to the conference report, to the end that my colleagues who are not here, and those others who may be interested may know how and why I feel as I do about the bill.

I may later speak in my own time when the conference report comes up.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. There is a time limitation now in effect.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me claim my own time.

Mr. RUSSELL. If it can be done in the Senator's own time, very well. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may be permitted to proceed but that the time not be charged to me.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thought I had the floor.

Mr. RUSSELL. I may say that if I surrendered the floor it might have been considered that I had spoken once.

Mr. CONNALLY. No, no; I will make an affidavit on that.

Mr. President, I shall not undertake at this time to reply to the Senator from Connecticut. I wish to say that the Senator from Connecticut was a very useful member of the conference committee and aided the committee very vitally in perfecting the bill. It was with the deepest of gloom that the other conferees, both of the House and the Senate, viewed his failure to sign his name to the report. All five of the House conferees signed, and four of the Senate conferees, including the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], and myself. However, all the views which the Senator from Connecticut has expressed here were expressed quite eloquently and quite cogently and quite forcibly to all the conferees. Notwithstanding that, the conferees agreed to the report. When the report formally comes before the Senate I shall then seek the opportunity to make adequate reply to the points which the Senator from Connecticut has urged at this time.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the very distinguished Senator from Texas yield for an inquiry?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will if I have the floor.

Mr. McNARY. When, in the opinion of the able Senator from Texas, will the conference report come before the Senate?

Mr. CONNALLY. I hope it will come before the Senate tomorrow, because under the House rules the House cannot take it up except by unanimous consent until tomorrow. But I have consulted the parliamentary authority of the Senate, and he advises that if the House should act early in the day at least the Senate may then take the bill up because our rules do not require that the bill lie over.

Mr. McNARY. Of course, consideration of a conference report is always in order in the Senate even when there is a bill of any kind pending.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. But I had hoped that we probably would have until the first of the week further to study the report in the light of the comment made by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut. We will see how that works out tomorrow.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me say a further word. There are printed copies of the report, with the change of only one or two words, which do not change the meaning but simply change the text, which set forth the provisions of the bill, and I hope all Senators will consult copies of the report and read them before the report comes before the Senate.

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I am always glad to yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DANAHER. I first wish to thank the Senator for his kind personal observations, and to assure him that I was not arguing this matter at this time, but simply out of candor and out of fairness and equity to my colleagues, I felt impelled to make a statement of the reasons why I found myself in disagreement with the Senator from Texas.

Let me add, Mr. President, that whenever I find myself in disagreement with the Senator from Texas I want to make absolutely certain that I have good reason for my position.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator. I wish to say that the Senator from Connecticut, with rare zeal and industry, both when he is right and when he is wrong, pursues very forcefully his objective, and I want to thank him for the many contributions he made to the effort to put the bill in proper shape. I only regret that he, like Brutus when he stood near the statue of Pompey, stabbed the report just as we were getting ready to start.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Green	Overton
Austin	Guffey	Pepper
Bailey	Gurney	Radcliffe
Ball	Hatch	Revercomb
Bankhead	Hawkes	Reynolds
Barbour	Hayden	Russell
Bilbo	Hill	Scruggs
Bone	Holman	Shipstead
Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Bridges	La Follette	Stewart
Buck	Langer	Taft
Burton	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	McCarran	Tobey
Capper	McClellan	Tunnell
Caraway	McFarland	Vandenberg
Chandler	McKellar	Van Nuys
Chavez	McNary	Wallgren
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Walsh
Connally	Maybank	Wheeler
DanaHER	Mead	Wherry
Davis	Millikin	White
Eastland	Moore	Willis
Ellender	Murdock	Wiley
Ferguson	Murray	Wilson
George	Nye	
Gerry	O'Daniel	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I shall endeavor to be as brief as possible in the discussion of this subject. First, I shall undertake to compare briefly the provisions of the substitute offered by the Senator from Virginia with the committee proposal. I must say in all deference that in listening to the remarks of the very able and distinguished junior Senator from Virginia, I was reminded of a current song hit, I've Heard That

Song Before. The Senator made a very able argument, but it was almost identical with the same argument he made on this proposition last year. I have before me the RECORD of May 18, 1942. I find that at that time the Senator inserted the statement which was made by one Paul Morris, as well as an editorial from the New Republic magazine. His recent discussion has been almost identical with the discussion had last year. I even understood the Senator to revert to some person named Sandy Garrett, of Childersburg, Ala. The RECORD of May 18, 1942, covers six pages of matter taken from photostats showing the horrible delinquency of Sandy Garrett, of route 1, Childersburg, Ala. The Senator from Virginia has again embalmed that individual in the records of the Congress and has shown his horrible dereliction. It turns out that it has been established beyond peradventure of doubt that Sandy borrowed \$1,107.55 and repaid only \$27.79. I did not hear the statement of the figures today. I do not know whether Sandy has done better or worse with his loan this year than he did with his loan last year; but I assume he is still delinquent. Of course, Mr. President, when farm loans are made to the poorest risks this Nation knows—people absolutely without any resources, without any means of establishing credit—we shall find that some individuals will not be able to repay their loans; and I doubt not that poor Sandy Garrett, of route 1, Childersburg, Ala., has a number of companions who have not paid the loans which have been made to them over the period of time during which the program has been in operation.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I was simply going to ask the Senator if there was not some evidence that in the flourishing twenties loans were made by the United States Government to a good many foreign nations, and I was going to ask whether in their repayments they did very much better than Sandy has done.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, Sandy is in goodly company, the difference being that most of them did not have an opportunity to go down in history by having their cases charted in the Senate 2 years in succession.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. My time is limited, but I shall yield to the Senator.

Mr. BONE. No; under the circumstances I shall not ask the Senator to yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. The argument that loans were made for the payment of poll taxes was made last year. I am opposed to the bill for abolition of the poll tax; the Senator from Virginia also is opposed to it. Consequently, I do not see why he objects to the payment of poll taxes. Both of us have objected to the bill the purpose of which is to abolish by action of the Federal Government the payment of poll taxes. We have objected to the bill, not because we are opposed to having poll taxes abolished in our re-

spective States, but because we believe that the action to abolish them should be taken by the States themselves.

Reference was made to the fact that some of the persons who had borrowed money used some of the money to go to the motion pictures somewhere; and the witness, when grilled by the committee, broke down and confessed that it was wholly possible that, among the persons to whom millions of dollars had been loaned during the time the program was in operation, some of the borrowers had escaped the supervision of the Farm Security Administration supervisor, and had gone to motion-picture shows. Of course, the witness undertook to point out that any person who had borrowed funds from any other source was likely to have used some of the borrowed money in order to go to a motion-picture show.

So, Mr. President, it seems that the effort is being made to put these borrowers in a class unto themselves, when the entire objective of the whole Farm Security program is to bring them up into the class of all other American citizens, and to remove them from the segregation which they have endured by virtue of their poverty during all the years before this program sprang into being.

I shall not go into the merits of this question, other than to say to Senators from States which are largely populated by urban residents that they had better stop, look, and listen before voting to strike down the Farm Security Administration. That is what this amendment would do. Having failed to kill it outright, this is a proposal to kill it by slow strangulation over a period of 12 months.

Of all the sources of increased food production in the United States, the Farm Security Administration is paramount. The big farmers cannot greatly increase their production. The little farmer has labor available in himself, his wife, and his children. The only hope of increased food production is with the little farmer. I could fill the RECORD with statements from the hearings showing the extent to which this activity has been carried on throughout the Nation. The increase in food production among the 450,000 people dealing with the Farm Security Administration was 3 times greater than the national average. There is a simple reason for that. A man who has 20 acres in a farm-security loan can take care of a thousand chickens, 10 hogs, or 5 milk cows, and carry on all the work he has been doing, and still produce the food which is essential to the war effort, and for which there will be a greater demand as the months go by. The investment in this appropriation is but a small matter to consider when we reflect on the potentialities of the program.

The proposal of the Senator from Virginia, as he says, is made in an effort to consolidate. I would not be unkind enough to mention the fact that some Senators who have been most vociferous in their condemnation of the Appropriations Committee for legislating are now seizing upon this amendment as an opportunity to change the order from what it has been for the past 6 or 8 years, and to set up an entirely new system, dealing

with this question legislatively. We have a proposal to create an entirely new system. The amendment provides that the loans shall be made through the Farm Credit Administration, which is a quasi-Federal agency, including the Crop and Feed Loan Division, which is limited by statute as to the amount of loans. I will ask the Senator from South Carolina what the present limitation is. I have forgotten. What is the limitation on the individual borrower?

Mr. SMITH. Four hundred dollars.

Mr. RUSSELL. The loans are to be made through the Farm Credit Administration and the Production Credit Association, which are wholly farmer-owned-and-controlled loaning agencies, and which require collateral of their borrowers. That is where this program is proposed to be placed. The supervision of it is to go to the Extension Service. No one has a higher respect than I have for the Extension Service, and no Senator has supported it more earnestly in the committee down through the years, when we were increasing its appropriations under the increment provided in the fundamental Bankhead-Jones Act. However, the Extension Service cannot and will not ever give the type of supervision which is required if we are to make a genuine effort to rehabilitate farmers.

Speaking of extravagance, it would be the height of extravagance to make an allowance of only \$4,000,000 for collecting and servicing nearly 500,000 loans outstanding, as well as lending \$40,000,000 additional. The loss to the Government would be far greater than a reasonable appropriation to supervise the rehabilitation of farmers and collect loans. The work is really in the nature of vocational education.

There is another very great difference between the proposal of the Senator from Virginia and the committee proposal. I refer to the question of grants. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Virginia absolutely eliminates any grants to those in distress on the farms. It matters not how great a catastrophe may visit them. If through act of God a crop were absolutely destroyed in any way, under the proposal of the Senator from Virginia, there would be absolutely no agency of Government which could go into the afflicted area and afford any relief by way of grants to farmers who have seen their barns go down the river, or who have seen their crops parched from day to day beneath the blistering sun, or who have seen their fields ravaged by grasshoppers or insects.

The question of rural rehabilitation projects has been brought into this discussion. The Senator from Virginia this year, as last, discussed the horrible failure of the Arthurdale project and some other subsistence homestead projects. I am willing to concede that those projects were failures; but I say that whatever its faults may be, the failure cannot properly be charged to the Farm Security Administration. Every one of the subsistence homestead projects was in being when the Farm Security Administration was established in September 1937. Not

one of them is under the jurisdiction of the Farm Security Administration today. Every one is in the National Housing Agency; and yet when we come to discuss the Farm Security Administration, these failure projects are brought up. I grant that they were failures. The failures are brought in and charged up to the Farm Security Administration, when they were all built by some other agency, and are now under the jurisdiction of a totally different agency.

The committee bill provides for the liquidation as expeditiously as possible, of the Rural Resettlement projects. The amendment of the Senator from Virginia is silent on that question. It makes no provision for them. However, I understand he has an amendment which he said he intended to offer to another provision of the bill at a later date. The one which I understood him to read provided for the elimination within a fixed period. I say, Mr. President, that with the gigantic investment which the Government of the United States has in these projects, whether they are good or bad, it would be the poorest kind of business for us to require their liquidation within a period of from 12 to 18 months. We want them liquidated as rapidly as possible; but when they are forced on the market in a lump, who will buy them? It will be some man who has enough money to buy the whole thing at once, and who will make an inordinate profit out of the disposition of the lands he buys. It is much better to proceed with the liquidation in an orderly way, selling a bit here and a bit there, getting as much as we can, rather than legislating so as to increase the loss of the Government and prove that these projects were a complete failure.

Mr. President, I reiterate what I said last year, in view of the precedent before me. Only 8 out of 195 of these projects throughout the Nation were instituted by the Farm Security Administration. All the others were begun by other agencies of Government, under the subsistence homestead program, under the program of the Resettlement Administration, which was directed by Mr. Tugwell, or under the supervision of the Department of the Interior; and they were all dumped on the Farm Security Administration by Executive order. Only 8 out of 195 were really commenced by the Farm Security Administration; yet all the sins of all the departments which have had to do with these projects during their long and tenuous lives are being charged up to the Farm Security Administration every time this appropriation item comes to the floor of the Senate.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is it not a fact that when Senators criticize the Farm Security Administration for the omissions or sins of some other agency, they forget the many projects and the many rehabilitations which the Farm Security Administration has successfully conducted throughout its history?

Mr. RUSSELL. They forget them, or they do not care to discuss them.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is it not a fact that 92 percent of the indebtedness in connection with loans in the rehabilitation effort has been paid back?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is referring to the rehabilitation loans, is he not?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is true. I say, Mr. President, without fear of successful contradiction, that in view of the credit risk which is assumed in making such loans, the collection record is nothing short of phenomenal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair calls the attention of the Senator to the fact that he has exhausted 15 minutes of his time.

Mr. RUSSELL. I will take time on the bill, Mr. President. In the matter of farm tenant loans to farm tenants to enable them to buy farms, the payments last year, including advance payments, represent about 150 percent of the maturities. Bear that in mind. The borrowers in many instances have anticipated the maturities on those loans. Approximately 99 percent of all the borrowers are current, and have met their maturities as they fell due. Where can we find a similar record in any other lending activity of the Government, when we consider the fact that the farmer, above all other people in this country, is subject to distress from the elements and from insects, and is most likely of all to suffer failure of his income in any given year?

We now come down to the rural rehabilitation loans. I should be the last to say that there have not been made many loans which were too large. Undoubtedly, in dealing with this problem involving about a million different farm families in approximately 2,300 counties of the United States, excessive loans have been made in many instances. Let me say, Mr. President, that, in my judgment, if the facts could be thoroughly sifted it would be found that as many loans had failed because they were not quite large enough as had failed because they were too large. Where a man has no energy or ambition, as—I do not wish to be personal—our friend, Sandy Garrett evidently has not, of course, he will not repay his loan. But, Mr. President, I say that we are dealing with people in this loan program who have never had a chance to live, and if 75 percent of them were put on their feet as independent, self-sustaining, valuable members of society, the money lost on the other 25 percent would be the best investment the United States has ever made since the beginning of its history.

The record as to rehabilitation loans shows that for the current year, including prepayments, the collections will amount to 93 percent. I wish to point out that when these farmers have as good a year as they had last year they are just about as good a credit risk as anyone else in this Nation. Last year, there was loaned them ninety-seven and one-half million dollars, and \$131,000,000 was collected. Of course, a great deal of it was past due, but it showed that the persons to whom the loans were made appreciated them, and that when they had the money

at least a great majority of them would pay it back as willingly, Mr. President, as would you or I.

Mr. President, I believe in this program. It has had faults, weaknesses, and maladministration, but its objectives are too important to the perpetuity of our institutions of government for us to strike this program down by adopting such an amendment as that which is now pending. I ask Senators to go out, if they will, into the areas where the sharecroppers and tenants are found. I have lived amongst them all of my life. I have seen them, Mr. President, move their little chattels and one-horse wagons in the fall to another farm and start making a new crop with a landlord who was not able to finance them and without any means of credit for themselves. I have seen children who could not go to school until the period of what is called the lay-by time in the summer, which is between the time of cultivating the crops and harvesting them. The next year history repeats itself, and when the children have reached 17 or 18 years of age they leave home, marry, and start a new crop of sharecroppers and tenant farmers who live almost without hope in a country which is supposed to be the hope of the world. We cannot afford to strike those people down. They are entitled at least to one chance in life. If there is one Sandy Garrett, there are thousands of others who offset him, who are standing on their feet today, owing no man, or the Government of the United States, making an honest contribution to the war effort through the production of food, and holding their heads high as independent American citizens.

Mr. President, this amendment should be rejected and the Senate should adopt the committee proposal which provides perhaps for an appropriation smaller than it should be.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I should like to propound an inquiry to the Senator from Georgia. As I understand, the amendment provides for liquidation of the cooperatives, or whatever they may be termed, whether poorly or well managed.

Mr. RUSSELL. Whether poorly or well managed, it provides for the liquidation of them all.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, if I may, I should like to comment on what the distinguished Senator has said in connection with grants.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will then be speaking on his own time.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Would time be available to me at any later time on the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No, under the agreement the Senator is entitled to only one speech on the bill, of not exceeding 15 minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield the floor, Mr. President.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, in 1940, when a hurricane struck, and great tracts of agricultural land in South Carolina and along the coast were destroyed,

as Governor of the State of South Carolina, I made every effort through various agencies in Washington, to obtain funds. Through the Disaster Loan Corporation I obtained some funds, and also through the F. S. A. Had it not been for the grants and loans made by the F. S. A. many hundreds of farmers, who today are producing for the war effort in South Carolina, would not be there.

The distinguished Senator from Georgia well remembers, as do other Senators, that in the summer of 1941 there was no agency of Government connected with agriculture or otherwise that was willing to lend money or to assist the farmers of South Carolina. During that summer and fall more than 30,000 farmers, as shown by the records in the department, received aid and were able to carry on. Today many of them are producing for the war effort. Many of them were more than rehabilitated. Their sons, as well as the sons of others, are in the Army today.

Mr. President, I hope that if the co-operatives shall be liquidated, the Senate will appropriate sufficient money for the only organization of Government I know of, so far as the farmer is concerned, which has always been ready and willing to help the fellow at the bottom of the ladder so that some day he may reach the top.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I helped in the preparation of the appropriation bill in the Committee on Appropriations, and I believe I understand the purposes of the appropriation for Farm Security.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] stated the truth. It is the one agency of the Federal Government which really helps him who needs help. How many millions of dollars have been advanced or loaned to industrialists or to men who actually had credit in the normal places of credit?

The Farm Security Administration has been denounced as communistic. I deny that. I believe that the rehabilitation feature of Farm Security is one which keeps the farmer from being communistic.

Mr. President, there is nothing which the American loves and adores more than a home. Give the average American citizen a piece of land and a roof over the heads of his children, and he will not be a Communist. Unless we continue such an agency as Farm Security and the policy it tries to carry out, communism may rear its head.

I have no fear as to the winning of the war, because we are going to win it; I am not at all concerned with the Nazis or the Japs, because we are going to whip them; but I am concerned with millions of American farmers, and millions of other Americans throughout the entire country, who have not had homes. Do Senators realize that of the 7,000,000 farmers in this country only 50 percent of them can say, "This is my home; this is my property"? And here is the Government, with a sound policy, trying to rehabilitate American citizens, advancing them a little credit which they cannot get elsewhere.

Ask a farmer in Tennessee, or Arkansas, or New Mexico, with 2 acres of land and an old mule, to go to a local banker

and see how much he can get. He will not get a dime. Is there an obligation on the Government to aid such a citizen? That citizen furnishes soldiers, he furnishes the ones who make the supreme sacrifice. He certainly is entitled to a little help, which is all he wants. He wants a little help in order to enable him to carry on so that he may eventually, through his efforts, be able to say, "This is my place. I am a free citizen of the country. I pay taxes, I send my children to school, I produce for the war effort, I am a member of society." What is the matter with the Farm Security Administration when we consider a situation such as that?

Transfer the functions of the Farm Security to other agencies of the Government, as is contemplated by some of the amendments proposed, and what would happen? I know about the agencies of the Government. Many of them would not look at a farmer, especially if he were poor, and perhaps did not own a piece of land. The Farm Security Administration has a heart, a heart which Americans revere, and the organization is doing a fine job.

I hope the amendment of the Senator from Virginia may be rejected.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I listened to an address the other evening over the radio by the Honorable Herbert Hoover, former President of the United States, and with many things in his address I agreed. One thing brought out in this radio talk was the fact that the former President, the Food Administrator during the last war, predicted in a most serious tone that there would be a food shortage in this country this year. That opinion is shared by many prominent persons, because of a number of factors which exist at the present time.

I hope these persons are wrong, but I am not going to do anything in the way of legislation which in my opinion will curtail the production of food one iota in connection with the war effort. Whatever prejudice I may have against the Farm Security Administration, whatever prejudice I may have against Mr. Baldwin, a gentleman who I think should be out of office, and I hope that at sometime soon he will be removed from his office; whatever prejudice I may have with respect to the resettlement propositions which have been discussed on the floor of the Senate—and I have heard the same type and kind of argument for the last 3 or 4 years—I shall not permit such feelings to affect my vote in this particular case.

Mr. President, I know that the Farm Bureau Federation in my section of the country is against this proposition. The Farm Bureau Federation has been my friend, and I am a member of the organization at the present time in my own county in Illinois. But here again I must differ with them, because of what I see in connection with the production of food not only for soldiers, but for civilians as well.

It has been repeatedly stated on the floor of the Senate that between 400,000 and 500,000 families are affected through this type of legislation. I undertake to say that if the House provision should become law it would seriously cripple

the production of food, which is being carried on by the group of farmers whom the pending legislation seeks to aid.

I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Georgia, to see whether or not the article I am about to read is correct, because to me it says a great deal, and it has helped me make up my mind in connection with my vote on the pending bill. The article says:

We are making a big thing of importing 5,000 farm workers from the Bahamas. Here are 500,000 farm families, our citizen brothers, who have been helped by farm security loans to a point where they produced last year 36 percent of the national increase in milk, 23 percent of the national increase in dried beans, and 10 percent in eggs and chickens, though they number but 7.6 percent of the Nation's farmers.

I should like to know whether or not there is any Senator who cares to challenge those figures, or agree with them, because they are extremely important. They are taken from an item written by Mr. Samuel Grafton for the Washington Evening Star of April 27, 1943. Does the Senator from Georgia know anything about those figures?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, those figures are in accord with the figures submitted by the witnesses appearing before the committee, and I had adverted to them briefly by saying it was a fine thing having that much of a percentage of increase come from 450,000 farmers out of a total of 6,000,000, and particularly those who were supposed to be less privileged.

I do not think there can be any doubt that the chief field of increased production of commodities of the nature alluded to is among farm security borrowers, because there is no available labor for the farmers elsewhere. There are farmers who do not have the facilities with which to proceed, but who can produce if we give them supervision and credit with which to purchase the chickens and the cows and hogs in order to produce the pork and the milk and the eggs and the poultry which are needed.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator, and I wish to say one word in conclusion.

I know nothing about how the program is administered in other States, but insofar as the State of Illinois is concerned, in my opinion the program has been administered in a very efficient and economical manner, although I have heard many stories to the contrary as affecting other sections of the country.

There is one thing the Committee on Appropriations has done in connection with this matter; it has taken into consideration the very thing I have been discussing, and has dealt with the question accordingly, in my humble opinion.

Mr. President, I heard the Senator from Wisconsin today speak of the lack of help, assistance, and when the farmers are crying for help we find the Bankhead law assisting individuals on the farms in order to increase the production of food.

We hear the suggestion constantly being made by Members of Congress that the Army be allowed to help produce the food for the coming year. So far as I am concerned, when I see this dilemma

in front of me with respect to the food situation I cannot reach the conclusion, merely because of some prejudice, because of some feeling in the past, because of some individual in a bureau who is not administering the law perhaps in the way it should be administered, that I should deny between 400,000 and 500,000 farmers of America the right to continue to obtain rehabilitation loans in order to help them produce the food which this Nation needs, both for the military and for the civilian population next year.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I wish to make a statement in behalf of the situation which obtains in my State. The picture is a very sad one. According to the 1940 Census, Mississippi has 335,939 farm families. Of that number, only 97,226 are owners of their farms. Of the total number of farm families in Mississippi, 192,815 are farm tenants. There are 45,594 farm laborers. They are not tenants. They work by the day. In other words, there are 238,413 homeless farm families in Mississippi out of a total of 335,939 farm families. There are over 240,000 farm families who, according to my distinguished friend, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] cannot sing Home Sweet Home.

The Farm Security Administration has come to the relief of over 25,000 of these homeless farm families in my State, and of that number, 2,600 are applicants for farm ownership. The only reason there are not more applicants for the ownership of farms is that not sufficient money has been made available by the Congress to make the loans to the 240,000 homeless farm families in Mississippi.

I am glad to report that the 2,600 clients of the Farm Security Administration under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act program have paid 96½ percent of their indebtedness, and during the last year their payments have exceeded their obligations.

Mr. President, while the picture in my State possibly is gloomier than that in any other State in the Union, I wish to plead with my colleagues to reject the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and to stand by the committee provision so as to make available this gracious service to the 240,000 homeless farm families in my State.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I have heard all the moving and pathetic pleas which have been made in defense of the committee amendment. They range all the way from Home Sweet Home to Nearer My God to Thee. All those who make the pleas, however, omit one important fact. It costs our Government \$1 to loan or give away \$3 through the F. S. A. Any agency which spends that much money in overhead is careless and extravagant, and reflects upon the Government and the activity which it represents, and upon the Congress, and it ought to be abolished.

I shall vote for the Byrd amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Virginia a question. Do I correctly understand that under his amendment there will still be available \$50,000,000 for the purposes

which have been referred to, only that the money will be distributed by the Farm Credit Administration instead of the Farm Security Administration? I do not understand that the Senator, by his amendment, is doing away with rural rehabilitation loans.

Mr. BYRD. The amount is \$40,000,000.

Mr. TAFT. Forty million dollars, plus twelve million dollars; is that not true?

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. A total of \$52,000,000 would still be available for the meritorious purposes which have been referred to?

Mr. BYRD. The Senator is exactly correct.

Mr. TAFT. Is that not more than sufficient to carry any family which is already receiving help, and also aid a large number of new families which are not now receiving help?

Mr. BYRD. I certainly think so.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I feel a measure of guilt, after having served for days on end with the very able Senator from Georgia on the committee which had been giving consideration to this annual agricultural supply bill, because I have not felt equal to pitching in and helping him carry at least a small share of his burden. Perhaps it is as well that I have not been taking any part in it, because, after all is said and done, the Senator from Georgia, it must be admitted, has done an amazing job. No one can better appreciate that than those who serve on a committee dealing with such a bill as this. After the House had virtually rewritten the legislation, and destroyed so many features that we have fought year after year to win, it was not a simple matter to sit down and deal with the hundreds upon hundreds of items in the bill that had to be dealt with separately. The Senator from Georgia has won my utmost appreciation not only by the manner in which he has represented the committee on the floor of the Senate, but by the manner in which he conducted the very difficult hearings and the writing of the bill.

Mr. President, since the life of the so-called Byrd committee, I have served as a member of the committee with the distinguished Senator from Virginia. I know how utter is his sincerity of purpose in the objective of his amendment. I should like to go along with him in support of the larger purpose he and his committee have been serving, but I must depart from him completely as respects his recommendations concerning the future of F. S. A.

A year or so ago, when that committee submitted its recommendations to the Senate, including a recommendation involving the abandonment of the F. S. A., I concurred in the report, except that feature of it dealing with F. S. A., because I had come as closely as anyone could come to intimate acquaintance with the work the F. S. A. was doing.

I cannot now go along with the Senator on his amendment. I cannot do other than insist in my own small way that the Senate stand by the Senate Appropriations Committee in its recom-

mendations with respect to the future of the Farm Security Administration. With all its failures and in spite of all the criticism for which it has given cause, I hope that the purpose served by the Farm Security Administration is here to stay, not only this year, but through the years to come, for it has served in a field which had too long been ignored.

The Farm Security Administration has brought returns which are altogether good for our Nation. So broad a claim as this, of course, is bound to invite a flood of challenges built around faults and failures, most of which I would readily acknowledge. F. S. A. has been guilty of playing favorites. F. S. A. has extended help to some who have been undeserving. F. S. A. has engaged in some foolish experimentation, and has given cause for charges of contributing to collectivism and regimentation. F. S. A. has caused some persons to abandon initiative and resign themselves to a dependence upon government. All this I will admit. But these faults and failures have been so largely remedied and eliminated and have been so insignificant by comparison with the great services rendered deserving individuals that I entertain firm belief that the agency of F. S. A. can be made to win returns which will afford and hold vast advantages to our whole country.

Without the help which F. S. A. made available in my own and other States during recent trying years I know that we should be facing terrible need and failure on every hand. Instead of that, and largely because of F. S. A., I can point to hundreds of successful farm operations today, hundreds of farm families who have been helped to their feet, making tremendous contributions to the food needs of their country in this emergency, and paying not only their real estate and personal taxes but paying income taxes to the Federal Government as well.

In the hearings of the Senate Appropriations Committee will be found merely a very few of the evidences which have come to me of the part which F. S. A. has played in rehabilitating able, deserving farm people who had been all but destroyed by drought and adverse economic conditions. Endless are the personal cases I could recite for the Senate's information demonstrating how people who were hopelessly down and out were saved by F. S. A., given the help in dollars they needed, who have paid back every penny they borrowed and are now most productive parts of our national economy.

There is much room for administrative improvement in the conduct of F. S. A. It is the duty of Congress to force those improvements and hasten elimination of the faults and weaknesses of the administration. But it certainly does not follow that we must abandon an agency which today is playing so vital a part in our economy as F. S. A. has done and is doing. Some persons will insist that there is no such need for F. S. A. today as there once was. Of course, that is the case, but there still is room for it, and who knows when there

might exist as vital a need for it again as there was before.

I hope the Senate will stand with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the committee. In the committee we have gone into the subject with thoroughness. We find such vast advantages growing out of what F. S. A. has done and such large repayment of the loans which are being made that we feel secure in the belief that this agency can carry itself with little or no loss to the Government ultimately.

Let me, while on my feet, give expression of my appreciation to the approval by the Senate of the committee's action on the issue of crop insurance, the removal of the prohibition on sales of wheat below parity, the issue of increased appropriation for soil conservation, the proposal to make R. A. C. C. incentive loans, and other most important matters, including the authorizing of parity payment on crops of next year. Only by these policies are we going to build an agricultural industry sufficiently strong to withstand the tests which are upon the industry now and which are certain to follow this war.

I should be unfair to myself if I did not, here and now, pay my compliments to the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. Never have I known a Senator so thoroughly to acquaint himself with the hundreds of problems presented by an agricultural appropriation bill. The Senate has had occasion to observe during recent days the splendid knowledge and efficiency of the Senator from Georgia. To have worked with him, hour after hour, upon this bill, and to have had a hand in accomplishing the gains won in the bill has been both a great pleasure and an honor.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I shall not long detain the Senate. I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the distinguished and able junior Senator from Virginia; and in support of the amendment recommended by the full Appropriations Committee. It should be borne in mind that the service rendered by the Farm Security Administration has been rendered to those at the bottom of the rural economic ladder. They are the group in this country who, prior to the time when the Farm Security Administration's assistance and credit were made available to them, had no hope of improving their economic status insofar as their own existence or the future of their children were concerned. They are the group, Mr. President, who as the Senator from Georgia so well said, probably would have been considered the poorest credit risks to be found in the United States. Yet, while this program has been in operation, more than 1,500,000 families have received help of some type from the Farm Security Administration. Credit has been furnished to approximately 935,000 families so as to enable them to obtain livestock, equipment, and other essentials they need in order to operate their farms. Trained county supervisors have advised them on their farm and home plans. Those plans call for the production of two or more war-essential foods for market, food and feed

needed at home, and for cash income needed to furnish their necessities and to pay their debts.

Mr. President, it is a misnomer to call this fund an administrative fund in the sense that an administrative fund is ordinarily considered as an administrative expense. As the junior Senator from Georgia has said, the plan has been as much a farm vocational-educational program as it has been a credit program; and only as adequate supervision and assistance of a technical nature are given to those families who previously have had no opportunity, has it been possible for them to be rehabilitated and to repay their interest and principal. Therefore, to condemn the program on the basis of a statement that it costs \$1 in supervision for every \$2 loaned, which I do not concede to be true, is to indicate an utter lack of understanding of the entire program.

My fear is that the Committee on Appropriations has cut this fund too deeply, and that as a result the proper supervision and technical assistance may not be sufficiently available. To the extent that such assistance fails, to that extent will the loans fail, and to that extent will the program fail.

The plan of providing credit with personal guidance has worked well. Many farm families were in desperate circumstances, unable to obtain credit from any source, until the Farm Security Administration gave them assistance. With such help and by their own hard work they had repaid, by December 31, 1942, nearly \$338,000,000 of the approximately \$712,000,000 of loans which have been made.

Mr. President, in the face of that record, I say that the evidence presented to the House committee, the evidence presented to the Byrd committee, and the evidence presented to the Appropriations Committee shrink into insignificance. It consists of a few flyspecks which have been gathered up out of the mistakes which must have been made in a program of such great magnitude, dealing with persons without sufficient farm management experience and, in many cases, without sufficient education.

I say that in relation to the constructive achievements which have been realized in making better American citizens, the evidence presented against the F. S. A. to the House committee, to the Senate committee, and to the Byrd committee should not be dignified by giving it attention. Ninety percent of it would not have been admitted in a police court anywhere in the United States. Ninety percent of it is of the most hearsay character of any alleged evidence I have ever heard or read.

The total repayments, including advance payments, amount to 91 percent of the maturities. Repayments, excluding advance payments, were 85.5 percent of maturities. Approximately 200,000 families have repaid their loans in full. Let that fact soak into the minds of Senators. Two hundred thousand families who, before the Farm Security Administration gave them assistance, were at the bottom of the rural agricultural ladder have repaid in full the loans

which have been extended to them by that organization.

Mr. President, I say that such a record compares favorably with the loan record of any private insurance or other agency operating over a similar period of time with similar clients.

These borrowers are not only repaying well, but they are also recovering their position as self-reliant farmers. I say to my conservative friends in this body, on both sides of the aisle, that it is shocking to me to see them band together to tear down an agency which, upon the admitted facts, has been restoring the hope of equality of economic opportunity which made this country great, and which makes men believe in and willing to die for democracy.

If we wish to create in this country such a condition that radicalism will find fertile soil, just allow the tendency adverse to individual ownership of the land by the people, which has been progressing since the turn of the century, to proceed to its logical conclusion. Permit the industrialization and mechanization of agriculture to continue to its logical conclusion, and we shall pave the way for communism or fascism in this Nation. If we want to maintain the moral fiber of democracy while we are fighting abroad on the military fronts and on the seven seas of the world, do not strike down an agency which is enabling so many people to restore their belief that there is a measure of opportunity in this country for men and their families to rise above the level of squalor and poverty.

The Farm Security Administration has not only been doing the job of rehabilitating farmers in America, but it has been doing an amazing and outstanding job in increasing food production. A survey of the 1942 food-production records of 463,941 farmers shows that this group, which made up only 7.6 percent of all the farmers in the United States, supplied 36 percent of all the increased milk production; 27 percent of all the increased production of dried beans; 10 percent of all the additional chickens, eggs, and peanuts produced; 9 percent of the increased pork production; 7 percent of the increase in the production of beef and sugar beets; and 3 percent of the increased production of soybeans.

Shall we strike down an agency which has been enabling a relatively few farmers in the United States to contribute so greatly to the need for increased food for our armed forces, for the lend-lease requirements, and for the civilian population? I say that this great record is indisputable. The survey was made under the supervision of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics; and no Senator in his right mind will question the professional statistical character and standing of that Bureau of the Agricultural Department.

Mr. President, at this point I ask to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a table showing the total increases for a number of food products.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Increases in production of essential crop and livestock products between 1941 and 1942, by all farmers and by Farm Security Administration borrowers¹

Product	All farmers		Farm Security Administration borrowers		Percent of net increase by all farmers contributed by Farm Security Administration borrowers
	Amount increase, 1941 to 1942	Percent increase	Amount increase, 1941 to 1942	Percent increase	
Milk (pounds).....	3,914,000,000	3	1,419,000,000	20	36
Pork (pounds liveweight).....	² 2,252,000,000	13	192,400,000	36	9
Eggs (dozen).....	516,000,000	15	49,800,000	31	10
Beef (pounds liveweight).....	² 1,767,000,000	11	124,300,000	38	7
Chickens (pounds liveweight).....	² 366,365,000	14	37,100,000	36	10
Peanuts (pounds).....	1,028,000,000	70	101,700,000	88	10
Soybeans (bushel).....	104,000,000	98	3,360,000	106	3
Dry beans (pounds).....	110,500,000	6	30,100,000	34	27
Sugar beets (tons).....	1,616,000	16	113,000	24	7

Total number of all farmers..... 6,097,000
 Number of actively supervised Farm Security Administration borrowers producing in 1942..... 463,941
 Proportion of all farmers who were actively supervised Farm Security Administration borrowers (percent)..... 7.6

¹ Based on a survey, approved by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, of records of Farm Security Administration borrowers at the end of the 1942 crop year.

² Preliminary unpublished Bureau of Agricultural Economics estimates of commercial slaughter plus home use. Chicken figures include commercial broilers.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, the value of the Farm Security Administration has not been limited to the direct contribution which farm families are now making to the war effort. The F. S. A. borrowers not only are growing large quantities of scarce foods for America; they are not only repaying their loans well, but also are recovering their position as self-reliant farmers. They will bulwark the Nation for the years to come. By the end of 1941 the net worth of the average farm security rehabilitation borrower, the value of what he owned over what he owed, had risen 43 percent since the time they came under this program. The actual net worth of the families, which averaged \$871 before they received F. S. A. help, had increased by 1941 to \$1,242. Does anyone think that families which have gone through that experience are on the road to communism? No, they are on the road to Americanism.

I say that it is a blind and destructive conservatism which would strike down the achievements of an agency which is making a record of this kind—a record which cannot be successfully disputed. All that can be found against the F. S. A., after the expenditure of considerable sums of money, is the kind of tripe appearing in the record of the House committee, the Senate committee, and the Byrd committee. I stated before, and I repeat, that such evidence would not be admitted in a police court in a trial for stealing a chicken.

The net family income had increased an average of 80 percent, or from \$480 to \$865. The families had learned to grow and conserve more food for the family table. The \$327 worth of home-used food produced in 1941 was almost exactly double the \$163 worth which the family had been accustomed to using. Does anyone think that children brought up in such an improved dietary situation will make less desirable American citizens? Does anyone think that they will be less willing to die for American democracy on some far-flung battlefield?

I say that this is an activity of the Government of which every true American may well be proud. In my judgment,

it is the kind of activity which must be encouraged and developed in this country. We must restore the measure of equality of economic opportunity which existed when we had a great public domain, which could be thrown open to exploitation and use, where individuals and their families could go and take up new land and acquire an economic stake in America. It is the closing of the door of economic opportunity by the exhaustion of the physical frontier and by the development of modern industry that threatens democracy in America. It is not foreign propaganda. Developments of an inexorable economic nature are taking place right here at home.

Of course there have been mistakes in this program. There is not a Senator who, if he had been appointed to administer it, would not have made mistakes. How are we going to help the people at the bottom of the rural economic ladder without sometimes making mistakes? The opponents of the Farm Security Administration ought to develop more than one case to embalm in the records of the Senate for 2 years in succession—the case of some poor fellow in Alabama who missed the boat.

Farm planning and sound credit have been accompanied by other types of aid. More than 117,000 farm families, or 615,000 persons in 1,071 counties of 39 States, through medical plans worked out with physicians, are receiving medical care at a cost which they can afford to pay. Does it make them Communists to give them some medical care, to stop some of the ravages of disease which has taken such a horrible toll in infant and maternal mortality in this group at the bottom of the rural economic ladder in America? I say no. A thousand times no.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator on the amendment has expired.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I will take time on the bill.

I say that we are helping to build better American citizens, who will have greater love for their country than they would have had if they had grown up

suffering from rickets, or with teeth missing, or afflicted with some other disease caused by rural poverty.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an interruption?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am glad to yield briefly.

Mr. BONE. I wonder what would happen to some of our institutions in America if by congressional action we should blot them out if they should make financial mistakes. I have been watching the newspapers lately, and they are all singing hymns of praise now for the holding companies in the utility field. Their admitted business operations would give a polecat convulsions. They have cost the people of the country billions of dollars. The whole crowd ought to have been in the penitentiary for their maladroitness operations.

According to the theory advanced here, because the F. S. A. has made some mistakes, we should incontinently blot it out. On that theory we ought to destroy all the holding companies in the utility field, without a single exception. If we are to enthrone in America the philosophy that an institution which makes some financial blunders is to be blotted out, a novel theory will be established in American political practice. I am glad to see that we are tending in that direction. It will make everyone very careful from now on.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I will say to the Senator from Washington that I think the amazement we should express in viewing this great constructive record should be that there have been so little loss and so few mistakes in comparison with the size of the program and the disadvantages of the people involved.

Complaint has been made that some rehabilitation borrowers have been given grants. Grants have been given only on the same basis as grants were given to other farmers. Should an individual who had borrowed a little money and who had a crop failure or sickness be denied relief because of that situation?

Criticism has also been made where borrowers have had hard luck, and were not able to make the grade in a particular year, but there was still hope for their being rehabilitated, and the F. S. A. issued additional notes to take up their delinquency and the interest due. This is a common practice of every commercial loan institution in the United States, and yet because it is done for a poor indigent farmer in America it has been denounced here as an uneconomic practice.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator referred to losses which had been sustained. The amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia places the administration under the seed loan and production loan officials.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Well, I was wishing I had those figures, and I hope the Senator will put them in the Record, because I myself thought it would be fine to put them in now.

Mr. RUSSELL. This organization has done a good work.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I agree.

Mr. RUSSELL. But these are unsupervised loans. From 1918, when they were made, down to 1940, the repayments amounted to 64 percent as compared with an average of more than 86 percent by the Farm Security Administration.

In the years of 1938, 1939, and 1940, which were reasonably good crop years, the average for those years was 78.92 percent as compared with an average of more than 86 percent over a longer period by the Farm Security Administration, and 93 percent for last year, which shows that not a great deal would be gained by placing this in the seed-loan class. We must also bear in mind that those who borrow from the seed-loan fund have to give a chattel-mortgage on their personal property before they can obtain the money, whereas the other borrowers start from scratch.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Certainly, and it has been suggested that the limit of \$800 should be raised for these seed loans. I shall vote for it, but every Senator knows that no small farmer needs to borrow \$800 for seed for 1 single year. Let us be frank about it, Mr. President. To adopt the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia would be to kill the service which has been rendered to the farmers at the bottom of the rural economic ladder in America. It would deny them credit; and that is said without any criticism whatsoever of the Farm Credit Administration or the farm-production associations, or any other of the organizations mentioned in the Senator's amendment. They are not equipped, they are not in a position, to render the kind of service which has been rendered by the Farm Security Administration.

Mr. President, voluntary debt adjustments have been made with the creditors of more than 107,000 farmers to enable them to carry on. That means that approximately 107,000 farm families have been saved from losing their farms as a result of the voluntary credit work done by this organization.

About 201,000 families are sharing the cost of farm machinery, sires, and other farm-improvement services. More than 17,000 of these services have been successfully undertaken with Farm Security Administration loans.

Mr. President, with all the criticism which can be made of F. S. A., with all the evidence, hearsay or otherwise, which has been dragged in against this organization, this magnificent record of constructive rehabilitation of great numbers of American farm families, and their restoration to self-respecting positions in our society, stand out like a mountain peak against a molehill.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I have already discussed the amendment offered by me, and I shall take only a few more minutes of the time of the Senate.

I wish to take sharp issue with the Senator from Wisconsin in his statement that the amendment offered by me would deny any aid to the low-income group of farmers. That, Mr. President, is simply not correct, because the emergency

Crop and Feed Loan Division of the Farm Credit Administration has now made 1,491,655 loans to low-income-group farmers in this country, limited in this instance to \$400. To say that the proposal made by the Senator from Virginia to transfer the Farm Security Administration to the Farm Credit Administration under the administration of the Crop and Feed Loan Division will deny all loans to the low-income group of farmers is simply not correct.

Mr. President, I wish only to refer to another statement which has been made, and that is with respect to the cost of the Farm Security Administration.

The Treasury records show that from April 8, 1935, to December 31, 1941, there had been loaned \$576,000,000, in round figures, and grants amounting to \$137,000,000 had been made, or a total of \$714,000,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to state to the Senator that my information, which I am sure is correct, is that the Farm Security Administration did not come into being until September 1937; but the Senator is using the figures of 1935.

Mr. BYRD. I am using the figures of the rural rehabilitation program of the F. S. A. and its predecessor agency.

Mr. RUSSELL. Then that is a correct statement.

Mr. BYRD. The cost of their personnel, such as salaries, was \$198,000,000, and so forth—an aggregate of \$275,000,000.

Now, Mr. President, some reference has been made to the percentage of loans which are current. I merely wish again to invite the attention of the Senate to what I referred to this morning, namely, that Mr. Baldwin testified that when in many instances these borrowers became delinquent in their installments new notes were taken, and the loans would then be declared current. So I submit that the figures which have been given in percentages cannot have any real validity.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia proposes—as has been fully discussed—to transfer the Farm Security Administration to the Farm Credit Administration, and to operate it through the existing Crop and Feed Loan Division and the production credit associations.

It provides for an appropriation of \$12,000,000, of which \$8,000,000 shall be available to the Extension Service to provide such farm and home management assistance as it may be necessary to borrow. That \$8,000,000 compares with \$16,000,000 which I understand is available under the Farm Security appropriation proposed.

It is then proposed to make available \$40,000,000 of loans. Let us recall that now perhaps there is not as great need for these new loans as there has been in the past and, while this is a reduction in the loans made available, yet under the conditions which now exist, if these

loans are soundly administered, \$40,000,000 will be sufficient, in my opinion.

I do not desire to take further time, as I know the Senator from Georgia is anxious to dispose of the pending proposal.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I desire to claim the floor for a brief time, largely for the purpose of asking a question or two of the Senator from Georgia which I shall be glad to have him answer in my time, as to the general purport of the committee amendment. It may be that it will be retracing some ground which the Senator from Georgia has covered during my necessary temporary absence from the floor.

I have discussed this matter many times privately with the Senator from Georgia, and I say frankly, in asking the questions, that it has been my observation that the consensus of opinion in my own State, on the part of those who have had opportunity of observing the operations of the Farm Security Administration, is that nearly everyone is in favor of continuing and perpetuating the functions of that Administration, but that nearly everyone complains about the extravagance and waste in the Administration, and certain communistic tendencies in some sections of my State and in other sections of the United States, doubtless inherited from the Tugwellian administration of the predecessor agency.

I can best express the consensus of opinion I have had by reading a letter, very briefly, from the editor of the Missouri Farmer, the organ of the Missouri Farmers Association, the greatest farm agency in the State of Missouri, one of the greatest in the United States, and one of the greatest farm cooperatives in the United States, Mr. H. E. Kleinfelter, who is also the head of the legislative committee of the Missouri Farmers Association. He says:

We knew that Farm Security Administration was involved in the bill, although we did not understand all the angles at this distance from Washington, nor was there time for us to investigate. We realized Farm Security Administration needed drastic pruning—it, too, is an overgrown bureaucracy—but we were in possession of no facts to pass judgment on it. Common sense tells one that less relief is needed during current times.

Farm Security Administration, with all its faults, has helped many a poor devil who had been turned away by everybody else, and we are wondering if some means has been provided in the bill to continue this aid—to those who are now struggling up the economic ladder, and aid to those who will need it badly after the war ends?

Mr. President, in view of the fact that nearly everyone in the country is in favor of continuing the functions, the professed objectives, of the Farm Security Administration, continuing the good work they have done, as Mr. Kleinfelter says, of helping many a poor devil up the hill when he could not get relief anywhere else; also in view of the fact that nearly everyone in the whole United States is opposed to the waste and extravagance which have undoubtedly

been existent in the administration of this office, I should like to have the Senator from Georgia, even if he has already done so, in my time to explain what provisions of the Senate amendment make correction of the existing conditions in this agency, particularly what suggestion there may be for correcting the extravagant tendencies of Mr. Baldwin. The Senator knows I discussed this matter with him several times, and I think the Senator knows my position on it.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think I understand the Senator's position, and we are not far apart. We are in practical agreement as to our objective.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will say to the Senator that in our private discussions I thought we were in entire agreement, but when I read the amendment the Senator brought in from his committee, unless the Senator can make some further explanation of it, I am not at all certain we agree.

Mr. RUSSELL. I wish to say that there is no stronger friend of the Farm Security Administration than I have been, but I think there have been some people in the Farm Security Administration who have seized the rehabilitation program as an occasion for presenting their own views as to the organization of farmers and the manner in which farm labor should be handled.

As to migratory labor and the camps, last year the provision for the Farm Security Administration specifically authorized them to administer such camps in certain sections of the country. That is eliminated from the Senate committee amendment this year. There is nothing in the bill, no appropriation, authorizing the Farm Security to deal with the migratory labor problem. It is now being handled by an officer of the Army and Mr. Chester Davis, under the provisions of the special labor act, with which the Senator is familiar. That relates to one question at issue which was raised by the Senator's correspondent. It did not make any difference how earnest many of the Farm Security officials might have been to promulgate ideas out of harmony with those of the Senator or with my ideas, it is another matter when it comes to dealing with the ordinary farmer.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am not trying to insist on my views being followed by any governmental agency, but I do not wish to appropriate money for a governmental agency with which to propagandize its own views or to compel its own views in violation of the general practice and of existing law.

Mr. RUSSELL. That refers to one question raised by the Senator. The farm migratory labor and the camps and the handling of the labor have been entirely divorced from the Farm Security Administration by the pending bill and the preceding act.

The Senator referred to extravagance. The total funds carried for the current year, 1943, direct appropriations and re-appropriations for administration and for grants, was \$41,986,743. The Senate committee bill carries \$29,607,573. This is a reduction of more than \$12,000,000.

I say that that is a very drastic reduction in the administrative expenses.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I agree that is a very substantial and very meritorious reduction. The only question in my mind is that the Senate committee apparently has made no restriction on the use of the money.

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, Mr. President—

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. We have had many bills presented for this agency in the past, showing they have spent exorbitant sums in telephone charges and telegraph charges, in addition to the enormous use of the franking privilege. It seems to me all those matters are things which are fairly subject to congressional review and reduction.

Mr. RUSSELL. They are.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator's committee has made a very excellent and a very drastic reduction in over-all administrative expenses, but, as I understand, it is still left to the discretion of the administrative agency, which at the time is Mr. Baldwin, as to how the money shall be expended.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know of any item in the bill which is broken down into dollars and cents for communications and travel. Such appropriations are always in lump sums.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I understand that, but it seems to me that in the case of this agency the appropriation could be broken down, and some restrictions should be put on the amount which can be squandered for telephone and telegraph bills, which I use only as an example.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator knows that when we cut an appropriation over 25 percent, there must be some reductions in expenses all along the line.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think that is true.

Mr. RUSSELL. It might be that in making the adjustment within the total appropriation allowed by Congress there was too much allocated for travel.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think that has certainly been true in the past.

Mr. RUSSELL. I wish to point out that the committee amendment, so far as the activities of the Farm Security Administration are concerned, is much more restrictive than the amendment of the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the Senator from Georgia thinks he can convince me of that I shall be glad to have him attempt to do so in my time, and if he convinces me I shall vote for the committee amendment rather than for the substitute amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is not more restrictive as to amount. Of course, the amendment proposed by the Senator from Virginia reduces the amount very drastically. What I am talking about is the operations.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Let me interrupt the Senator from Georgia to state my position, which is, that so far as I am concerned, I am willing to appropriate every penny that is needed to carry out the proper functions of this agency, but I wish the money to be expended on the performance of the functions, rather than

being squandered in administrative expenses. I have been informed that over the period since the creation of this agency, that is the present agency and its predecessor agencies, nearly \$1 has been spent for administrative expenses for every \$2 either loaned or granted by the agency. Does the Senator know whether that is true?

Mr. RUSSELL. I know it is incorrect as to the F. S. A.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The figures which are furnished me—and I have them from several different sources—show that from April 8, 1935, to December 31, 1941, the Farm Security Administration and its predecessors have cost the Government by way of administrative expenses a total of \$275,861,889.27, in order to make loans and grants totaling \$714,092,031.52. That is not exactly in proportion of 1 to 2, but it is almost in that proportion. Does the Senator think there is any justification for such a proportion of administrative expense?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; I do not think so at all. The one thing that I have thought to be unfair all the way through in connection with consideration of the Farm Security Administration—and heaven knows the Farm Security Administration has done enough that is subject to criticism, without bringing it in—is the fact that the doings of the predecessor to the Farm Security Administration, under Tugwell and others, have all been bundled up and tied in with the figures of the F. S. A. I do not think that is fair.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I take issue with the Senator from Georgia on that point, because it is the Tugwellian influence, if I may use that expression, in the Farm Security Administration, which is really a subject for debate here. As to many of the activities of the Farm Security Administration no one takes issue. It is the chimerical projects, and excessive use of the telephone and telegraph and other extravagances and waste of money, that are subject to criticism. That is the question which is at issue.

Mr. RUSSELL. There was a substantial reduction in travel expense and in communications expense last year. A very drastic reduction in those expenses for the next year will inevitably ensue because of the reduction of administrative expense of over 25 percent. The administrative expense of the Farm Security Administration will amount to 4.32 percent for the coming year, according to the Budget estimate. When we consider that these loans are made on a 3- to 5-year basis, and that supervision of them is in effect on the farms during the periods for which they are outstanding, I think that the percentage of expense is about as low as it can be, if there is to be assurance of collecting the money. What is lost sight of is that if \$40,000,000 is made available this year for loans, and the administrative expenses are \$15,000,000, or \$12,000,000, as proposed in the Byrd amendment, then the administrative expenses will amount to over 25 percent of the loans.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Missouri on the amendment has expired.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will take time on the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Since the loans are made over a 3- or 5-year period, certainly the administrative expense should not all be charged up to any one year.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Let me ask the Senator from Georgia if it is not a fact that under the contemplated breakdown—I understand it is not in the bill for this year—that the travel expenses are estimated at \$5,000,000, or approximately \$5,000,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not have the figures before me.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the Senator from Georgia were to go by train to Atlanta—it may be very difficult to get a reservation on the train if he were merely a United States Senator—but if he were to get into a Pullman car, or even break into a dining car, he would find at least five or six Farm Security Agency employees sitting at the tables of the dining car comparing their notes.

It seems to me there has been an entirely exaggerated amount of administrative expense. I am not trying to be cheese-paring or nickel-pinching, or meticulous about the thing, but I still cannot see wherein the Senator from Georgia, with all respect to him and to the Appropriations Committee, has made any particular change in the administrative provisions of this measure, with the single exception of reducing the appropriation for administrative expenses, which I grant he has done.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, that is done. That is manifest. There is no other way that economy can be effected than by reducing the appropriation.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What I had hoped was that when the Senator was bringing in the legislative amendment, which this admittedly is, he might have included legislation to restrict some of these obnoxious administrative practices.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have not had the experience the Senator from Missouri has had. I do not travel on trains a great deal, but I do not recall meeting Farm Security personnel on trains. They may have been on them, but they were not known as such to me. I do know that approximately 90 percent of the total travel expense allowed this year in the bill will be spent within the counties by the representatives who are servicing and supervising these loans. I do think, Mr. President, when we have an investment of so large an amount in loans we should not be too penurious with travel expenses of the men who are supervising the loans.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not desire to be too penurious, but the Senator from Georgia will be forced to admit that there has been outrageous extravagance in the administration of this agency. What I am troubled about is that there is nothing in the bill to curb the extravagance and the waste except a horizontal reduction in the appropriations.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know of any other way to bring about a reduction, and the Senator from Missouri does not know of any other way. If the Senator from Missouri does not regard a 25-per-

cent reduction in the total over-all expense a curbing of extravagance, I do not know what it is.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If I were a member of the committee and believed as the Senator from Georgia, that the Appropriations Committee has now become a legislative committee, and had a right to legislate, I think I could frame legislation which would be effective with respect to the use of the appropriation which is now being made.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator can express an opinion as to his belief, but he should not express the opinion that I believe the Senate Appropriations Committee is a legislative committee.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I was simply basing my judgment on the Senator's conduct in debating the bill yesterday. I have no desire to delay action on the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. It so happens that a substantial majority of the committee agreed with me.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. They are apparently in favor of the Appropriations Committee being a legislative committee.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, Americans to whom farm problems were never very vital—factory workers, salesgirls, streetcar conductors, truck drivers, and housewives—today have an enormous stake in matters affecting agriculture. Citizens from every walk of life now realize that the future of our common cause—prosecution of the war to victory and an abundant peace—depends largely upon how much food we have for our soldiers, our fighting allies, and our people here at home. Food policy is a part of United Nations strategy; it must, therefore, be patterned to meet the needs of democratic people everywhere.

The farmer, although his living depends on production of food and fiber, cannot today be the special beneficiary of our agricultural policy. He makes no such claim, I am sure; like patriotic citizens everywhere, he has pledged his land, his labor, and, if necessary, his life to victory. He is an American, first; a farmer, second. He knows that his welfare and that of our whole people are identical.

The paid professionals who in the name of the American Farm Bureau Federation claim to speak in Washington for the farmer, too often put the farmer's profits before his patriotism. In doing so they do him insult and injustice, they sabotage his unselfish service, they weaken his country's fighting strength.

In the current attack on the Farm Security Administration—an attack directed chiefly from the offices of the American Farm Bureau Federation—we have an example of the professional Farm Bureau lobby doing business as usual. It is zealous in the interests of the big farm and big plantation operators it represents, the operators who see in the war an opportunity to push the small-scale farmer off the land—to make him a tenant or a day laborer, to absorb his land into their vast holdings. It is reckless of our need for all the food the people of this land can grow.

The Farm Bureau has not demanded dismemberment of the Farm Security Administration as a means of increasing the war food supply. That would be an absurd claim to make; I doubt that even the bitterest critic of the Farm Security Administration has ever suggested that abolition of F. S. A. would give us more to eat. No one, not even the Farm Bureau contends that our war effort would be in the slightest degree furthered by the withdrawal of this assistance to small farmers.

Some do contend, however, that whatever food increase could be secured from the small farmer through F. S. A. assistance would be small and too costly. That, of course, is very different from arguing that there would be greater food production without F. S. A.

The American Farm Bureau Federation, then, has placed itself in a very strange position for a farm lobby. It is telling the public, in effect, "You cannot afford to buy more food through the F. S. A. plan."

This question is exactly the kind, I think, which should be answered by the public at large, rather than by farm interests—particularly by vested farm interests, such as the Farm Bureau in most States represents.

I think the factory worker, the streetcar conductor, the truck driver, and the housewife should be heard on this question of how badly we want more food and how much we are willing to pay for it. They have, perhaps, a greater right to speak on this matter than do farmers themselves. Certainly their interest is more legitimate than that of a paid lobbyist whose job, as he interprets it, is to keep prices up—if necessary by keeping production down.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics has reported that in the year ending March 15, the general cost of living rose 7.4 percent, and that in that same period food prices rose 15.9 percent. Those figures have been underlined for our attention by labor unrest. Within the last month there has been one major strike and a rash of lesser ones, all of them largely attributable to rising food costs and increasing food scarcities.

In my own State, potatoes, chickens, and meat have been largely unobtainable for long periods. Due mostly to scarcities of foods, prices have risen alarmingly in the past year in large urban areas like Pittsburgh. In that metropolitan area, for instance, the retail prices of all foods advanced 18.4 percent from April 1942 to April 1943. The average price per pound of butter rose from 43.1 cents to 55.6 cents during that period. In April of last year a Pittsburgh housewife could buy a leg of lamb at 31.2 cents a pound. In April of this year she had to pay an average price of 39.3 cents. Similarly, potatoes went from 42.7 cents for 15 pounds to 77.3 cents; oranges jumped an average of 12.9 cents a dozen; and the price of apples increased by one-half. Those figures are all from the Bureau of Labor Statistics—the most reliable source.

The current O. P. A. plans to reduce the cost of living will probably actually reduce average food costs by only about 3 percent. That will leave the cost of

living still far higher than a year ago; and we are told that, even with higher prices, there still will not be enough to go around, that the shortages are only beginning.

Assuming normal weather conditions—and in view of recent weather, such an assumption is too optimistic—total food production this year will be only about 4 or 5 percent more than last, according to the Department of Agriculture. Under normal conditions crop production will be about 9 percent less than last year, while livestock production will be about 10 percent higher.

From about the same total production as last year, we shall have to send to our Army and, by lend-lease, to our allies twice as much food as we did last year—25 percent of the total food supply, rather than 12 percent. There can be no thought of short measuring those who fight by our side so valiantly.

It is in this background that we must study the questions raised by the Farm Bureau: How much can we afford to pay for more food? How much can we afford to pay for the food increases that will keep our industrial workers hard at their jobs without interruptions? How much can we afford to pay for the food increases we must give our soldiers and fighting allies?

I do not know what the Farm Bureau's answers to those questions might be. I do know that our people in the cities want utmost abundance. I know, too, that the rank and file of farmers want to grow every pound of food they possibly can grow.

The recent figures from the Bureau of Agricultural Economics show that of the country's 6,000,000 farmers, about 2,000,000 are already operating at or near capacity. Their farms, which at present are contributing about 80 percent of our total marketed agricultural production, can make almost no increases in food output unless a shift from nonfood items such as cotton and tobacco to more nutritive crops is encouraged.

At the other end of the scale, about a million and a half of the 6,000,000 farmers can make little or no increases because they farm only seasonally or are handicapped by inadequate land and other resources.

That leaves a middle group of about two and a half million farmers, of whom the Bureau of Agricultural Economics estimates that one and a half million can make substantial increases. They have enough labor and land to handle expanded operations, but they lack credit and, to some degree, skill. Apparently, higher farm prices will not solve their problem; at least they have not yet. From 1939 to 1942, prices which farmers received rose 70 percent, but total production rose only 18 percent.

We can easily see, by examining into the distribution of income among farm families, why it is that high prices do not enable the small farmer to expand his production.

Figures provided me by the Department of Agriculture show that if we divide the 6,000,000 farms into three income groupings, each of about 2,000,000 families, the average gross income of

the upper group was \$7,370 last year—an increase of 94 percent over 1939. This upper income group—about one-third of all farmers—had money left over at the end of the year to invest in expanded capacity. The lower-income third had an average income last year of \$800—48 percent more than in 1939, but still far too little to do more than pay family living expenses and current operating costs.

It is the middle-income third with which the Farm Security Administration is largely working and it is in that group that most of the 1,500,000 small farmers whom the Bureau of Agricultural Economics says might greatly expand their output are to be found. The average gross income of those farmers last year was \$1,640—53 percent higher than in 1939. If we want to know why that group is unable to buy the livestock, fertilizer, machinery, and other supplies necessary to be had in order to expand production, we must see where that gross income of \$1,640 goes. The Department of Agriculture gives this break-down:

Three hundred and seventy-five dollars is not cash income at all; it is the value of products grown on the farm, but used at home.

Six hundred and forty-five dollars is required for current operating expenses. They include largely the cost of the things the farmer buys for business purposes.

Three hundred and ninety dollars goes for family living expenses—a very modest amount, I should say.

One hundred and sixty dollars is needed for payment on outstanding debts.

That leaves only \$70 of the family's gross income—only \$70 which can be devoted to increasing production next year. Seventy dollars is a good deal less than half enough to buy one first-class cow.

The Bureau of Agricultural Economics, through its Chief, has said that nearly 1,500,000 of those small farmers are in about the same situation as were F. S. A. supervised borrowers before obtaining their loans, and that they could be expected to make about the same production increases as have the F. S. A. borrowers.

If that is the case, we might expect a very great benefit to our food situation from mobilizing those small farmers into the food production army. The Farm Security borrowers made increases last year at a much greater rate than did farmers in general. Here is a partial record of their increases, as shown in a recent F. S. A. program report:

During 1942, Farm Security Administration borrowers, although comprising only 7.6 percent of all the farmers in the United States, accounted for 38 percent of the increase in milk, 17 percent of the increase in dry beans, 9 percent of the increase in eggs and chickens.

In terms of the yearly food requirements of robust American men, the 1942 increased output by Farm Security Administration borrowers would supply eggs to feed nearly 3,000,000 men, milk to feed more than 2,500,000 men, pork to feed more than 1,500,000 men.

It is evident, then, that the one and one-half million under-employed small

farmers can be assisted through the Farm Security Administration program to make very important contributions to our war food supply.

How much will it cost to secure those increases? F. S. A. experience with its 450,000 current borrowers provides the answer.

Although none of them were able to get credit from any other source, the F. S. A. borrowers have so far repaid on schedule 91 cents for every dollar loaned them. The F. S. A. has borrowed \$326,950,000 from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation since June 1940, and it has repaid to the R. F. C. all but \$77,000,000; and that sum is secured by notes in the ratio of 5 to 1.

We must recognize, of course, that credit alone is not sufficient to secure full production from the smaller farms. The F. S. A. has been successful because it has afforded the farmer supervision and training along with loans. Probably the Agency's educational services have been as important as its credit. At any rate, the cost of giving the small farmers guidance and new skills has been somewhat less than \$35,000,000 during the year.

I think, therefore, that we should be able to decide for ourselves—without any help from the Farm Bureau—whether the Nation can afford to buy food from small farmers. Indeed, we might ask ourselves this question: Now, in wartime, when our people at home are not getting all the food they want and when a hungry world is watching us, can we afford not to tap the enormous reserve capacity of our smaller farms?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Lucas in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alben	Gerry	O'Daniel
Andrews	Gillette	O'Mahoney
Austin	Green	Overton
Bailey	Cuffey	Pepper
Ball	Gurney	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Hatch	Revercomb
Barbour	Hawkes	Russell
Bilbo	Hayden	Scruggs
Bone	Hill	Shipstead
Brewster	Holman	Smith
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Buck	La Follette	Taft
Burton	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	Lucas	Tobey
Capper	McCarran	Tunnell
Caraway	McClellan	Vandenberg
Chandler	McFarland	Van Nuys
Chavez	McKellar	Wallgren
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Walsh
Connally	Maybank	Wheeler
Danaher	Mead	Wherry
Davis	Millikin	Wiley
Eastland	Moore	Willis
Ellender	Murdock	Wilson
Ferguson	Murray	
George	Nye	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Virginia to the amendment of the committee. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCLELLAN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON]. I am not advised how he would vote if present. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], who, I am advised, if present would vote "nay." Therefore, I am at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent from the Senate because of illness. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay."

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] are absent on official business for the Committee on Military Affairs. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from California and the Senator from North Carolina would vote "nay."

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program. I am advised that if present and voting, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are detained on important public business. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Idaho and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay," and the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea."

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent. I am advised that if present and voting he would vote "nay."

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], who would vote "yea," has a pair on this question with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], who would vote "nay."

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] would vote "nay" if present. He has a pair on this question with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], who, I am advised, would vote "yea."

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent. The Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea" if present.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] would vote "yea" if present. He is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 53, as follows:

YEAS—25

Bailey	Gerry	Taft
Barbour	Hawkes	Tobey
Bridges	Lodge	Vandenberg
Buck	McFarland	Walsh
Bushfield	Millikin	Wherry
Byrd	Moore	Willis
Clark, Mo.	Radcliffe	Wilson
Eastland	Revercomb	
Ferguson	Smith	

NAYS—53

Aiken	Gillette	Murdock
Andrews	Green	Murray
Austin	Guffey	Nye
Bell	Gurney	O'Daniel
Bankhead	Hatch	O'Mahoney
Bilbo	Hayden	Overton
Bone	Hill	Pepper
Brewster	Holman	Russell
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Scruggam
Capper	La Follette	Shipstead
Caraway	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Chandler	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McCarran	Tunnell
Connally	McClellan	Van Nuys
Danaher	McKellar	Wallgren
Davis	McNary	Wheeler
Ellender	Maybank	Wiley
George	Mead	

NOT VOTING—18

Barkley	Johnson, Calif.	Stewart
Brooks	Kilgore	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	Maloney	Truman
Clark, Idaho	Reed	Tydings
Downey	Reynolds	Wagner
Glass	Robertson	White

So Mr. BYRD's amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the first branch of the committee amendment, beginning on page 89, line 15, and continuing to line 5 on page 93.

Mr. RUSSELL. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Is a "yea" vote a vote in favor of the adoption of the second part of the amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays have been ordered on the first branch of the amendment, beginning on page 89, line 15, and continuing to line 5 on page 93.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. McCLELLAN (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON]. I am not advised how he would vote if present. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], who, I am advised, if present, would vote "yea," and will allow my vote to stand.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent from the Senate because of illness. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "yea."

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] are absent on official business for the Committee on Military Affairs. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from

California and the Senator from North Carolina would vote "yea."

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program. I am advised that if present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are detained on important public business. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Idaho and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea," and the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay."

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent. I am advised that if present and voting the Senator from New York would vote "yea."

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], who would vote "nay," is paired on this question with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], who would vote "yea."

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], who would vote "yea," is paired on this question with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], who would vote "nay."

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The result was announced—yeas 66, nays 12, as follows:

YEAS—66

Aiken	George	Nye
Andrews	Green	O'Daniel
Austin	Guffey	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Gurney	Overton
Bell	Hatch	Pepper
Bankhead	Hayden	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Hill	Revercomb
Bone	Holman	Russell
Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	Scruggam
Bridges	La Follette	Shipstead
Buck	Langer	Smith
Burton	Lodge	Stewart
Bushfield	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	McClellan	Tobey
Chandler	McKellar	Tunnell
Chavez	McNary	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Van Nuys
Connally	Mead	Wallgren
Danaher	Millikin	Wheeler
Davis	Murdock	Wiley
Ellender	Murray	Willis

NAYS—12

Barbour	Gerry	Taft
Byrd	Hawkes	Walsh
Eastland	McFarland	Wherry
Ferguson	Moore	Wilson

NOT VOTING—16

Barkley	Glass	Robertson
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	Kilgore	Truman
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Tydings
Downey	Reed	Wagner
Gillette	Reynolds	White

So the first branch of the committee amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next committee amendment passed over.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 93, after line 4, to insert:

FARM TENANCY

To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000-1006), as follows:

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses in connection with the making of loans under title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000-1006), and the collection of moneys due the United States on account of loans heretofore made under the provisions of said act, including the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, exclusive of printing and binding as authorized by said act, \$1,326,070.

Loans: For loans to individual farmers in accordance with title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000-1006), \$30,000,000, which sum shall be borrowed from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation at an interest rate of 3 percent per annum: *Provided*, That the amount which is available to any State or Territory for making loans under such title I shall be distributed by the Secretary, in accordance with rules prescribed by him, among the several counties or parishes in such State or Territory, except that he shall not distribute to any such county or parish in excess of three times the amount which would be distributed to such county or parish were the entire amount available to the State or Territory distributed among the several counties or parishes in such State or Territory on the basis of farm population and the prevalence of tenancy; and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is hereby authorized and directed to lend such sum to the Secretary upon the security of any obligations of borrowers from the Secretary under the provisions of title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000-1006): *Provided*, That the amount loaned by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall not exceed 85 percent of the principal amount outstanding of the obligations constituting the security therefor: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may utilize proceeds from payments of principal and interest on any loans made under such title I to repay the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the amount borrowed therefrom under the authority of this paragraph: *Provided further*, That the amount of notes, bonds, debentures, and other such obligations which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and empowered to issue and to have outstanding at any one time under existing law is hereby increased by an amount sufficient to carry out the provisions hereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 95, after line 11, to strike out:

SEC. 2. No part of any appropriation contained in this act or authorized hereby to be expended shall be used to pay the compensation or expenses of any officer or employee of the Department of Agriculture, or any bureau, office, agency, or service of the Department or any corporation, institution or association supervised thereby, who engages in, or directs or authorizes any other officer or employee of the Department or any such bureau, office, agency, service, corporation, institution, or association to engage in, the making of loans under the provisions of section 201 (e) of the Emergency R. I. and Construction Act of 1932 (12 U. S. C. 1148), as amended, or the making of loans or advances in accordance with the terms and conditions set forth in Food Production Financing Bulletins F-1 or F-2 of the Farm Credit Administration operating under the Food Production Administration, Production Loan Branch.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may I ask the distinguished Senator from

Georgia to give an explanation as to why this section was stricken?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the pending amendment is found on page 95 of the bill. The section proposed to be stricken was a limitation imposed by the House, which would have the effect of eliminating and prohibiting any loans made by the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation.

This agency was established by an act of Congress which was passed in 1932. A great many loans were made by the agency in 1933 and 1934, particularly to farmers engaged in the production of cattle. The Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation then remained more or less dormant for a number of years. Some loans were made, notably in the Wenatchee Valley of Washington, the great apple-producing section, and those loans all turned out very successfully, so far as the evidence submitted to the committee showed. A number of other loans of types F-1 and F-2 were made to encourage the production of farm products.

There was a great deal of testimony before the committee as to the propriety of this organization using F-2 loans as an incentive for food production. They are in the nature of nonrecourse loans. They are made to persons who increase their acreage of certain war crops to a very marked degree, and the sole collateral for the loan is the crop which is produced.

Representations were made in behalf of those who were interested in having the work of the Regional Agricultural Corporation stopped altogether. Other farmers were most anxious that it be continued. Today I received a telegram from a group of farmers in the State of Florida, reading as follows:

Please use your influence to get the Senate to strike out section 2 of H. R. 2481 (agricultural appropriation bill) now before agricultural subcommittee of Senate Committee on Appropriations.

They were in error as to where the bill was, of course.

I continue reading from the telegram:

Said section abolishes the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation. The credit available under this program is the only means the undersigned have of producing crops on 3,000 acres this year and 10,000 acres next year. Private capital, Federal Land Bank, Production Credit Association, cannot provide the necessary production funds. Greatly prefer this type of assistance to subsidies. We are all members of the Farm Bureau Federation and disagree with its program in this respect.

That telegram is signed by 20 or 25 men whom I do not have the pleasure of knowing personally, but it shows the type of representations made to the committee in regard to this matter.

Mr. President, the committee was not unanimous in its approval of the type of loans being made under the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation Act. Despite the insinuations, however, that have been made against the committee, and the charges which have openly been made that we were undertaking to legislate all over the face of the earth, we did not feel this was a matter which should be determined on an appropriation bill. It was new matter in the bill,

not like the other legislative provisions we have offered, which have been in the act from year to year. It was new matter, and had the effect of repealing, by a limitation on appropriations, the favorable action of the standing Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate and the Committee on Agriculture of the House.

So without regard to the views of the committee on this policy, the feeling in the committee was this is a question which should be handled by the standing committee. I believe reference was made to the fact that the Senator from Nebraska had introduced a bill which was pending before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and on which hearings were about to be had.

The Appropriations Committee clearly showed, in its discussion of this question, that it was almost the unanimous opinion of the committee that all the many ramifications of the various lending agencies of the Federal Government dealing with the farmers should be coordinated and reorganized. We are not a standing committee, and we did not undertake to violate the rules of the Senate by bringing in a legislative proposal which would have reorganized all the credit agencies. To protect the rights of the standing committees of the Senate we struck out the House provision, which we looked upon as an infringement upon the prerogatives of the standing committee which had the bill under consideration.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Georgia for his explanation.

I should like to see section 2 reinstated in the bill as it came from the House. I think it is a wise provision. All it would do would be to provide a limitation on the use of the funds appropriated in the bill we are now asked to pass.

In effect, it would say to the Department of Agriculture, "You may use these funds only for the specific purposes provided in the bill." Section 2, as it came from the House, provides that the Department may not use those funds through the back door for any other agency for which there is no appropriation in the bill.

There are other limitations in the pending bill with respect to which no question has been raised. Turn to the bottom of page 3. In the provision for salaries and expenses for the Department of Agriculture there is a limitation on the appropriation.

Turn to page 66 of the bill, on which we took so much time day before yesterday. Beginning with line 16 and continuing through to the heading on page 67, "Conservation and use of agricultural land resources," a limitation will be found which I think is more far-reaching than the limitation in the particular section now under discussion.

Turn to pages 70, 92, and 93. Further limitations will there be found in this bill by which we are asked to make appropriations of funds which shall be used for the purposes designated in the bill.

When we come to page 95, section 2, we are asked to delete that section because it is desired that the Regional

Agricultural Credit Corporation shall continue to function with the personnel of some of the other organizations for which we are appropriating in this bill.

Mr. President, I say that this is a wise provision. If the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation desires funds to administer the act, it should come to Congress and ask for an appropriation. That is its right and privilege. If it does not have the funds to administer the act, it should not take funds from any other agency. We should protect the Department of Agriculture.

We have been told by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee that we are holding this budget down where it belongs. We have argued about expenses. He said the cut was made from \$54,000,000 to \$32,500,000 in one of the administrative provisions, I believe in connection with soil conservation. Then there was an argument on the floor, and a motion was made by the able Senator from Michigan, and we had a sort of auction, and agreed on \$30,000,000, cutting two and a half million from the appropriation for the administration of the act. Yet, we turn around and let the Department of Agriculture finance the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation by taking funds out of that Department and by subterfuge setting up personnel without coming to Congress and asking for an appropriation.

Mr. President, I say that this is a wise provision. It has been said that some point was raised in the House of Representatives as to whether or not it was new legislation. It is not new legislation. There is not an appropriation asked for here.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not say it was new legislation.

Mr. WHERRY. I understood the distinguished Senator from Georgia to say in the latter part of his remarks that he felt that we should leave this to the legislative committees, that his was an appropriation committee, and that if the legislative committee wanted to take any legislative action, all right.

Mr. RUSSELL. I did make that statement, not on the ground that this is legislation, but that it had the effect of repealing legislation by a limitation on the appropriation.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the same thing indirectly.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have not made the point of order against it. I know that a point of order would not lie. Of course, it is a limitation on an appropriation.

Mr. WHERRY. A point of order was raised in the House on the ground that this was new legislation.

Representative HOPE, of Kansas, wanted this section taken out of the bill, and on April 19, 1943, in a discussion of the matter on the floor of the House, he raised the point of order and made the following statement in support thereof. I want the Members of this body to note the ruling made by the Chair on this very point:

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the section just read on the

ground it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like the gentleman to elaborate on his point of order and point out what part of the section is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. HOPE. This section has for its apparent purpose a prohibition of further loans by the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation. There is no provision in this bill making an appropriation for this Corporation. So the limitation on its face is against officials of the Department of Agriculture who might exercise supervisory functions over it and its activities.

The regional agricultural credit corporations were created in 1932 under the Hoover administration. There were originally 12 corporations, 1 in each Federal land bank district. Later legislation was passed which authorized the consolidation of the regional agricultural credit corporations and the return of capital not needed to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to be held as a revolving fund subject to the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration.

In the meantime, and on March 27, 1933, an Executive order was issued which transferred the jurisdiction and control of the regional agricultural credit corporations from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, under whose jurisdiction they had originally been set up, to the Farm Credit Administration, and in that order the functions which were transferred were defined as follows:

"The functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its board of directors relating to the appointment of officers and agents to manage regional agricultural credit corporations formed under section 201 (e) of the Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932; relating to the establishment of rules and regulations for such management and relating to the approval of loans and advances made by such corporations and of the terms and conditions thereof."

Under that Executive order and under the law it is the duty and the function of the Farm Credit Administration to make rules and regulations to supervise the operations of the regional agricultural credit corporations and to approve loans made by them. I think it is generally recognized under the rules of the House that any language purporting to be a limitation which either imposes new duties upon a Government agency or prohibits it from performing the duties which have been assigned to it is not a limitation but is legislation.

In this particular case the Farm Credit Administration is prohibited, or rather its officers are prohibited, under the legislation from directing or authorizing the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation to make loans and perform the other functions that are imposed upon it by law. That being the case, it is apparent that the officials of the Farm Credit Administration will be unable to carry out their duties in supervising the operations of the Corporation, in approving loans, and other duties which have been assigned to them.

It can very readily be determined that this is legislation, I think, by considering the interpretation which officials of the Farm Credit Administration will place upon our action if the section remains in the bill. Certainly they would understand it to mean that Congress no longer expected them to carry on the functions which under the law they are to exercise over the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation. In other words, they will conclude that Congress had changed its policy and has forbidden them to do what heretofore under the law they have been authorized and directed to do. That, Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, very clearly constitutes legislation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be pleased to hear the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I merely want to submit to the Chair the very purpose of the limitation is to prevent the expression of a certain task, function, or duty. It may never achieve that result, as a matter of fact, in substance, but that is its primary purpose. So I submit this is a very good limitation and quite within the rules and does not constitute legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The gentleman from Kansas makes the point of order against section 2 which begins "No part of any appropriation contained in this act or authorized to be expended shall be used," and so forth.

It is the view of the Chair this section is clearly a limitation, and if there are no funds provided in this section the limitation will be ineffective. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. President, this is not new legislation, it does not directly legislate the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation out of the functions for which it was created. This is merely a limitation on the appropriation set up in the act, and if we are the guardians and custodians of public funds, we should see that no money is taken out of an appropriation for any of these departments and then by back-door methods meted out to some organization which does not come in and ask for the appropriation for its functions.

I say it is a wise provision, I say the provision in section 2 should be reinstated. It is the only proper way to legislate. Back-door methods are not in order, and they should not be employed here in the Senate. If the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation want funds, they know how to get them, they know how to administer the act, but for them to come in and take it away from the other departments on the theory we are giving those departments all the money they should have, simply means that they are allowed to borrow funds and personnel from the other departments and paying for the personnel out of these other appropriated funds.

We had Governor Black before the Joint Committee on Reduction of Non-essential Federal Expenditures. He said the only reason why he wanted to put this in was the fact that he could go ahead and lend this money through the triple A chairmen and there would be no additional personnel, that it would not cost any money, that they would merely borrow. He was asked, "Then, if that be true, can they do without the personnel in the other departments?" He said they had plenty of time, they could use them in both departments.

What was his testimony as to that? I have here a transcript of the evidence taken before the joint committee, of which the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is the chairman, and the hearing was held on the resolution in which I asked that the R. A. C. C. be liquidated, that there no longer was an emergency, and that there was no need for it to function now. What was the testimony? I read now from the testimony of Governor Black:

Mr. BLACK. I do not know that one could name the most important. Manpower is of prime importance.

Senator WHERRY. Right on that question of manpower, let me ask you this: How could you make a greater saving on manpower than to combine all of your lending agencies into one and loan through that one lending agency, or to continue the production credit associations and the Farm Security Administration that are getting all the credit to the farmers which they need, rather than set up a new agency that will have a personnel that I imagine will be as great as either one of them?

Mr. BLACK. We are not using additional personnel, we are using existing personnel.

Senator WHERRY. What personnel are you using?

Mr. BLACK. We are using the personnel in the production credit associations, the national farm loan associations, certain numbers of Farm Security supervisors, in some cases Agricultural Adjustment Agency men.

Senator WHERRY. You mean that then the Agricultural Adjustment Agency will handle these loans?

Mr. BLACK. In some cases the Agricultural Adjustment Agency men. Ordinarily the man who has been handling the Commodity Credit loans would be the local representative.

Senator WHERRY. You would have to increase the personnel to make these loans, would you not, even in their own organization?

Mr. BLACK. No, sir.

Senator WHERRY. Will it not work out that way?

Mr. BLACK. I should not think so.

Senator WHERRY. If you want to loan \$225,000,000, you can still do it on the set-up they have in my county?

Mr. BLACK. It is my understanding the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation is not planning to put on any personnel. They will reimburse the agencies for the service on a time-and-cost basis.

The CHAIRMAN. Reimburse other agencies on what kind of a basis?

Mr. BLACK. A time study and cost basis.

The CHAIRMAN. You mean you will borrow personnel from other agencies?

Mr. BLACK. Yes. They would be reimbursed by Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation for the time spent.

The CHAIRMAN. Then, will not the other agencies have to get new employees to take the place of the ones you borrow?

Mr. BLACK. It is not contemplated that they will.

The CHAIRMAN. They have too many now, then, haven't they?

Mr. BLACK. I do not know that, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. If they came to your agency, the number of employees you would require, either they have had too many or they have got to get other employees to replace those that they loan to you.

Mr. BLACK. There is always a certain amount of additional work that can be taken on in any agency.

The CHAIRMAN. How many do you expect to borrow from other agencies?

Mr. BLACK. Well, the services necessary for servicing these loans would require the services of one man in each county.

The CHAIRMAN. There are 3,000 counties.

Mr. BLACK. Approximately.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you consider then that there would be 3,000 employees that you would need?

Mr. BLACK. Well, the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation will not have any direct employees.

The CHAIRMAN. That is not my question.

You said you are borrowing these men and you are paying the other agencies for them.

Mr. BLACK. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. As far as the Government is concerned, they are just as much employees as if you paid them as your employees directly.

Mr. BLACK. That is correct. * * *

Yes; and there are 3,000 chairmen in the different counties and in addition to the 3,000 chairmen there would be the stenographic help that would necessarily have to be set up under the R. A. C. C.

So there are not only the 3,000 chairmen being paid for out of the funds which are appropriated in this bill, but, in addition, there will be the clerical help they will have to borrow and pay for, getting it from some other department, if they are to maintain and service the loans which they expect to make under the R. A. C. C.

This is a protective measure. If they have more personnel in the department than they need, we should not appropriate for unnecessary employees. If they have too many in the department, this is a good place to begin to cut the appropriations, rather than raise them at every turn of the road.

It is contended that the R. A. C. C. cannot function unless they get the personnel from the Department of Agriculture. I do not think that is true. That is the opinion of Governor Black, but Governor Black contradicted himself so many times when he was put on the stand that it is hard to tell exactly what Governor Black did think back in March, before he had time, apparently, to come before the committee and review and revise his testimony.

If Senators read the original act, in the back of the Byrd report—and it can be secured right here in the Senate Chamber—they will find in the original act provision that the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation be set up under the R. F. C., it is responsible to the R. F. C. and the R. F. C. has granted it, under this act, the authority to appoint its supervisors, and those supervisors can do anything provided in the act. Then the act provides:

All expenses incurred in connection with the operation of the Corporation shall be supervised and paid by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation under such rules and regulations as its Board of Directors may prescribe.

In other words, under the original act the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation can continue to function, under its own provisions, without borrowing personnel from different departments. That takes care of the situation in Washington where the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation, which was an emergency organization set-up, can continue to make loans out of the funds it already has, supervised by the Farm Credit under the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. It does not have to make any accounting to the Secretary of Agriculture. That is provided in the act itself. That was the holding when they said this was not new legislation, that this was simply a limitation on the appropriations in this act.

What is the R. A. C. C.? The original set-up made it a relief organization, the old barnyard-loan organization. I was one who helped to put it over out in Nebraska. Incidentally, I was one of the first directors of the F. S. A. in my county, and I helped to organize the first production-credit corporation in the district. I have had practical experience with these organizations. I

did not learn about them from a book. I know what their purposes are. I know what they were created for, and I know what they have been doing in the different communities in my own State.

The R. A. C. C. did a wonderful piece of work. It was organized to help in drought conditions. It was organized to help men get money in an emergency, when they could not get it from private sources, when there were no private banks to which to go; and it did a good job. During all that time it succeeded well. It was managed by credit men of experience, men who knew how to make a loan, and they made the loans, and did a good job.

I should be perfectly willing to keep that organization intact, as it is intact, and make these emergency loans as they are being made in Washington. Whenever there was an emergency, I would be perfectly willing to let them do it. But the R. A. C. C. became dormant in 1934. There came many other credit agencies after 1934, after the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation had served its purpose. Then came the Credit Production Corporation, then came the Federal Farm Security Act, and there are organizations that served their States and took over the functions of the R. A. C. C. The R. A. C. C. is unnecessary except as an emergency organization, and the department should only use it in that way.

What were the conclusions of the Byrd committee as to the R. A. C. C. being revamped to serve the purpose for which Governor Black said it would be used?

What is the first conclusion the Byrd committee reached?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's time on the amendment has expired.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall take 15 minutes on the bill.

1. The Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation loan program was created during the emergency of 1932 and 1933 in order to extend credit to farmers in the midst of a national drought. This particular credit emergency no longer exists.

That is the first conclusion the committee reached after all the testimony which had been taken, and the transcript of that testimony will fill a volume of tremendous size. The committee heard from farmers all over the United States. It heard from bankers over the United States. It heard from the departmental heads in Washington. Some of the testimony given before the committee I expect to place in the RECORD.

The committee said there is no emergency existing; therefore it is unnecessary to set up another bureau here in Washington. It is unnecessary at this time to bring in another agency and man it with 6,000 persons.

From the testimony let us see how badly we need this organization for food. I am not acquainted with a man named Mr. O'Neal. He did not testify before the Byrd committee, but he did testify before the Senate Appropriations Committee. On page 735, at the top of the page, will be found what Mr. O'Neal said with respect to the R. A. C. C.:

Mr. O'NEAL. In the early days, we thought there might be an occasion, as Senator BANK-

HEAD brought out, where you use that type of loan. But now we feel this way about it: We don't want to reestablish or revive an agency that will jeopardize the sound financing of agriculture. We don't want that. In other words, if that is used rightly, on a sound basis, it can do a lot of good, as it has done in emergencies.

Those are the words of Mr. O'Neal.

What does Mr. Patton say about the matter? On page 888 will be found testimony by Mr. Talbott. He was being examined by members of this committee. Mr. Talbott quoted what Mr. Patton said. I am not acquainted with Mr. Patton, but this is what Mr. Patton said:

As Mr. Patton stated, we urge expansion of the Farm Security Administration, and we should like to have complete war crop insurance. I believe there is already a bill up here on the Hill, before some other committee, to get a type of war crop insurance where the Government takes all of the natural risks. If we could get those two aids, we would not be particularly concerned about nonrecourse loans or Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation.

The provision with respect to the Farm Security Administration has been kept in the bill, and appropriation has been made for it. Since that has been done, we do not need R. A. C. C., according to Mr. Patton.

What does Mr. Goss, of the Grange, say? I read from page 899 of the same hearings:

Generally speaking, the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation should be continued in liquidation because cooperative credit and private credit are now available to supply most of the needs for which they were originally created. We would favor continuing a regional credit corporation fund for meeting emergencies, but we wish to point out that under the existing acts, the corporations are given the broadest possible powers of lending, the sole restriction being that the loans be made for agricultural purposes. Even the expenses of operation are paid by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

That, Mr. President, ought to dispel any fear in the mind of the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] that the R. A. C. C. could be maintained regardless of whether section 2 is put back in the act or not. The testimony of Mr. Goss is that the expenses of that Corporation are being paid, when making these emergency loans, by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Mr. Goss continues:

They were set up simply as emergency agencies, and the emergency for which they were created has passed.

Here we have the testimony of the heads of three farm organizations, and they go on record as saying that the emergency has passed, and that we do not need R. A. C. C.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I have only 15 minutes. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator when I am through. I hope the Senator will not consider me to be discourteous, but I wish to finish my statement if I may.

I now read conclusion No. 2 of the Byrd committee:

The revival of the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation loan program duplicates

wholly, or partially, the lending activities of 19 other Federal agricultural lending agencies performing identically similar or related functions.

I wish Senators would bear this in mind. When passing appropriation measures for any one of these organizations please bear in mind that many others are duplicating the work of the particular agency for which appropriation is made. I wish to read the list of agricultural lending agencies which are performing identically similar or related functions. How many Senators know how many there are? There are 20 of them. They are as follows: The Central Bank for Cooperatives, Commodity Credit Corporation, Disaster Loan Corporation, District Banks for Cooperatives, Electric Home and Farm Authority, Emergency Crop and Feed Loan Section, Farm Credit Administration, Farm Security Administration, Federal credit unions, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, Federal intermediate credit banks, Federal land banks, Land Bank Commissioner loans; national farm-loan associations, production credit associations, production credit corporations, Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration, regional agricultural credit corporations, and Rural Electrification Administration.

So, Mr. President, we have 20 organizations lending money to farmers on short- and long-time credit loans. I say that if nothing more comes out of today's discussion than this, that we enact legislation whereby we can streamline all these agencies into one and cut out the administrative costs of 19 of them and have one Government agency under one administration, with one set of personnel, take care of these loans, then the afternoon will have been well spent. But with the thousands of personnel these 20 organizations already have, to attempt to set up another organization and provide 6,000 persons for it is a waste of money. It is time to consider the matter of waste of money rather than the spending of money like drunken sailors, as has been done in connection with some of the appropriations which have been made.

Mr. President, what does the head of the Federal Reserve System say about this matter? I wish to read a letter from Mr. Eccles. I wish to thank the gracious Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] for sending me a copy of this letter. It is as follows:

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and
Currency, United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR WAGNER: This is in reply to your letter of March 31 in which you ask for an opinion as to the merits of S. 914, which provides for the dissolution of the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation.

That is a bill I introduced to terminate the R. A. C. C. Hearings were held on it before the Byrd committee, as I said, in February of this year. The bill provides for the dissolution of the Rural Agricultural Credit Corporation.

I continue to read from the letter:

I favor this bill because I believe that such agricultural production for war as is not now

adequately financed through regular banking channels or through the production credit associations can best be provided for by insurance of war crops.

Remember, Senators, this is Mr. Eccles writing to the Senator from New York.

I favor enactment of H. R. 2029, which has the endorsement of the Secretary of Agriculture, or of some similar measure, authorizing the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation to insure such war crops as the Secretary may designate. This will enable—

And, Members of the Senate, notice this particularly please—

This will enable private credit to flow directly from the banks to the insured borrowers and will avoid the difficulties, particularly the competition, which result from direct Government lending when there is, as now, an abundance of credit available to the private banking system.

I wish to say to the Senate that this very day there is in the banks of the United States of America \$38,000,000,000, nearly four times as much money as was in the banks in 1932, when the R. A. C. C. set-up was initiated.

Private lending agencies are looking for loans. They will take loans wherever they can find them. Mr. Eccles says in his letter that if we can provide for a credit-risk insurance arrangement extending down through the private direct-lending agencies—an arrangement such as those we have provided for under the Home Owners' Loan Corporation or under the insurance risk arrangements, we shall be able to utilize the private lending agencies of the country to do the very thing for which 6,000 persons, I think, will be required in order to finance and administer the R. A. C. C.; and that will eliminate the competition with the private lending agencies.

I read further from Mr. Eccles' letter:

As a matter of general principle, I am for Government measures which have the effect of facilitating the flow of private credit into production, whether in the field of agriculture or other necessary private business activity, and against measures that tend to supplant or compete unnecessarily with private enterprise. To the extent that the need may exist for Government aid to stimulate additional agricultural production, I am satisfied that this general principle and the war effort itself will be best served by reliance either upon insurance of war crops or upon some similar form of guaranteeing the producer against loss rather than upon establishment of competitive Government lending agencies in a field already well served by the numerous banks in the agricultural regions throughout the Nation, as well as by the production credit associations.

The foregoing expresses the opinion of the Board of Governors as well as my own.

Sincerely yours,

M. S. ECCLES, Chairman.

What more authority does the Senate want than that word coming directly from the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System? The heads of the Federal Reserve System desire to do the very thing I advocate. Yet, under the provisions of the bill, if we strike out section 2, we let the Secretary of Agriculture bring out a new agency to expand the loans to \$250,000,000, and they will be

able to pyramid that amount to \$500,000,000. Then the agency will be established, and will come back to Congress and request a larger appropriation; and we shall have a new bureau to finance. In my experience in the 5½ months I have served as a Member of the Senate I have found that it is very difficult to eliminate a bureau once it is established. The time to eliminate the bureau is before it commences operations and we now have a wonderful opportunity to perform that major operation.

Let me tell the Senate that I have received letter after letter from Production Credit Administration members and from F. S. A. members stating that they can lend the money just as profitably or even more profitably than can the R. A. C. C. Yet Mr. Black says they do not have the authority. In 5 minutes he could get all the authority he wanted. I think he has just as much authority to loan through these agencies as he has to take money from the Department of Agriculture and use it for the R. A. C. C. Where does he get his authority to do that? What right does he have to take the money? He has no more right to do that than he has to loan the money through any other agency. If he has a right to loan it through one agency he has an equal right to loan it through another agency.

What was the further finding of the committee? I read conclusion 3 of the Byrd committee's findings:

3. The Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation's loan program, by soliciting credit where the field is drastically limited, is depriving private lending institutions and country banks of their normal loan business.

That is their finding after considering all the evidence.

Their next finding is as follows:

4. The Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation's loan program may weaken the structure of over 11,000 country banks, which are carrying a great burden of the food-for-freedom program, and the direction of and collections from War bond sales in their respective communities throughout the United States.

That is the impartial opinion of the committee. On the committee sat the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NIEL], and the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] was the only one who sat through those hearings and who did not join in the report. That is their opinion, that is their finding, that is their judgment. I say such report should be seriously considered and followed by the Senate of the United States.

Oh, yes; I will probably be accused of carrying a portfolio for the private banks of the country; but let me say my word. This country was built upon private enterprise—the corner grocery store, the farmer and the merchant who went out and pioneered this country. They are the ones who built this great Nation. All of them obtained their finances from the country bankers. They are the people who developed this great Republic

of ours; they are the people who developed our great enterprises and institutions—the great American way of life for which we are fighting, and which we must continue. However, if we continue to socialize the credit of this country we shall have communism and we shall lose the very things our boys are fighting for. That will certainly come to pass, just as the senior Senator from Wisconsin said a few minutes ago.

I will fight to the last ditch for private enterprise. I will do all I can to eliminate governmental subsidized competition with private enterprise. I will oppose the establishment of unnecessary bureaus every time I get an opportunity to do so. I will do my part to see that the R. A. C. C. is not established. We do not need it. It is just another unnecessary agency with an added 6,000 personnel which could better be used in the war effort.

Some Senators are smiling. They may not smile 2 years from now. I say to the Senate that I have been out in the country, and I know what conditions are and what the people are thinking. I come from the sticks. I come from the country, and I know what the people there are thinking. Some one of these days Senators are going to wake up and find that we are spending \$200,000,000 a day. Some of these days they are going to find that they have mortgaged more than the assessed value of the country. Some one of these days they are going to find that they cannot even start to pay the principal of the indebtedness and that they will not be able to pay even the interest on the great debt that has been created. I am fighting to preserve the financial stability of the United States of America.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I am not speaking on the bill now. I should like to inquire whether it is the purpose to continue longer today. It is already 7 o'clock.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, when the Senate first convened this morning the distinguished minority leader expressed the hope that the Senate might pass the bill today; and the chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the bill, the junior Senator from Georgia, stated that he would do everything he could to have the bill passed today, and gave notice to the Senate that he would hope to have the Senate continue in session until consideration of the bill had been concluded.

Mr. GEORGE. I understand that. I also understand that there is a limitation on debate; and there is no reason to keep the Senate in session very long tonight. I desire to be heard on this amendment. If the committee insists on keeping the amendment in the bill—an amendment which has absolutely no excuse whatsoever for being in the bill—I am going to be heard as long as I can be; and there will be other motions coming on tonight—for instance, a motion to suspend the rule; and I do not understand that there is any limitation of debate on such a motion.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. There is not.

Mr. GEORGE. I understand that two motions to suspend the rule are in prospect. We shall not be able to finish at any early hour tonight. I am at a loss to know why the Committee on Appropriations struck out the amendment if only the R. A. C. C. is involved. I desire to be heard on that matter; because it is one action on the part of the committee for which there cannot possibly be any justification.

I now make an appeal that the Senate recess until tomorrow morning. It will be perfectly agreeable to me to have the Senate recess until 10 o'clock or 11 o'clock tomorrow. Certainly, we can finish consideration of the bill tomorrow if we recess now until the morning.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I join in the request of the Senator from Georgia. Frankly, I would have objected to the unanimous-consent request if I had been in the Chamber at the time when it was submitted. I desire to be heard for at least half an hour on the question of the school-lunch program, and my remarks would naturally require some debate by other Members of the Senate. It seems to me there is no such rush that we should be required to remain in session until midnight tonight.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I agree entirely with what the Senator from Georgia has said. The Senate has worked very diligently on the bill. If it had been possible to conclude its consideration tonight, it would be perfectly satisfactory to have the Senate do so; but the Senator from Alabama has given notice of a very important motion to suspend the rule. To his motion the agreement for limitation of debate does not apply, in my opinion; and I listened to the agreement very carefully when it was proposed.

I desire to give notice now that if the Senate is to remain in session tonight until the bill is passed, if that motion is made, the bill will be passed, very, very late tonight.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I wish to have expression made on the matter by the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, let me say that I am not at all impressed by the threats that we shall have debate; because I should not want to limit the opportunity of any Member of the Senate to debate the provisions of the bill. I have no disposition whatever to keep the Senate in session until an unduly late hour. However, the suggestion that the bill be passed today came from the distinguished leader of the minority, and was heartily concurred in by the acting majority leader, and I wholly approved of it.

The pending bill comes to us very late this year, as I have stated a number of times. We shall have to work day and night in conference in order to canvass all the items with the House. I do not know that at the very best we shall be able to place the bill in the hands of the President by the end of the present fiscal year. I do not want to be put in the position of making any threats or of

attempting to prevent the making of speeches. I enjoy hearing my colleagues speak. However, if the minority leader and the acting majority leader wish to have the Senate recess until tomorrow I have no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, what would the Senator think about a suggestion that the Senate take a recess now until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

Mr. RUSSELL. If we are to recess now I think we should meet in the morning. I should like to know the views of the minority leader.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I must defer, out of practice and courtesy, to the attitude of the Senator in charge of the bill. This morning I expressed the very strong hope that we could stay here and finish consideration of the bill tonight. There are 118 amendments involved. The bill must be approved by the 30th of June. I am anxious, as I think we all are, to get through with the appropriation bills, because we may be able to work out a summer recess. I think most of the Members of the Senate are willing to stay in session longer today; I think we should do so. At least I think we should dispose of this amendment. That is my view. However, I shall yield to the view of the Senator in charge of the bill. I have briefly expressed my view. I think the Senator in charge of the bill should decide for himself what he wishes to do.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, of course I will subordinate my judgment in the matter to the views of the Senator in charge of the bill. I think this ought to be said, however: Frankly, from conversations which I have had with certain Members, and an expression of views, I doubt whether we could make any progress tonight, in view of the feeling of a great many Members. It being very doubtful whether we could make any progress tonight, I am inclined to think—although, as I say, I subordinate my views to those of the Senator in charge of the bill—that we might as well take a recess now until 11 o'clock tomorrow. I shall be guided by the views of the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CHANDLER. Who has the floor? Has the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] yielded the floor?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Nebraska expired.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I claim the floor in my own right for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Buck	Danaher
Austin	Burton	Davis
Bailey	Bushfield	Eastland
Ball	Byrd	Ellender
Bankhead	Capper	Ferguson
Barbour	Caraway	George
Bilbo	Chandler	Gerry
Bone	Chavez	Gillette
Brewster	Clark, Mo.	Green
Bridges	Connally	Guffey

Gurney	Mead
Hatch	Millikin
Hawkes	Moore
Hayden	Murdock
Hill	Murray
Holman	Nye
Johnson, Colo.	O'Daniel
La Follette	O'Mahoney
Langer	Overton
Lodge	Pepper
Lucas	Radcliffe
McCarran	Revercomb
McClellan	Reynolds
McFarland	Russell
McKellar	Scruggam
McNary	Shipstead
Maybank	Smith

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Bilbo in the chair). Seventy-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. McNARY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business for the Committee on Military Affairs.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 14, nays 62, as follows:

YEAS—14

Bailey	Connally	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Ellender	Scruggam
Bone	George	Smith
Byrd	Gerry	Walsh
Clark, Mo.	O'Daniel	

NAYS—62

Alken	Hatch	O'Mahoney
Austin	Hawkes	Overton
Ball	Hayden	Pepper
Bankhead	Hill	Revercomb
Barbour	Holman	Reynolds
Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Bridges	La Follette	Shipstead
Buck	Langer	Stewart
Burton	Lodge	Taft
Bushfield	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	McFarland	Tobey
Chandler	McKellar	Tunnell
Chavez	McNary	Vandenberg
Danaher	Maybank	Van Nuys
Davis	Mead	Wallgren
Eastland	Millikin	Wheeler
Ferguson	Moore	Wherry
Green	Murdock	Wiley
Guffey	Murray	Wilson
	Nye	

NOT VOTING—20

Andrews	Butler	Gillette
Barkley	Clark, Idaho	Glass
Brooks	Downey	Johnson, Calif.

Kilgore	Robertson	Wagner
McClellan	Thomas, Idaho	White
Maloney	Truman	Wills
Reed	Tydings	

So the Senate refused to take a recess. Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Missouri.

The motion was rejected.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Gillette	O'Mahoney
Austin	Green	Overton
Bailey	Guffey	Pepper
Ball	Gurney	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Hatch	Revercomb
Barbour	Hawkes	Reynolds
Bilbo	Hayden	Russell
Bone	Hill	Scruggam
Brewster	Holman	Shipstead
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Buck	La Follette	Stewart
Burton	Langer	Taft
Bushfield	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Capper	McCarran	Tobey
Caraway	McClellan	Tunnell
Chandler	McFarland	Vandenberg
Chavez	McKellar	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Wallgren
Connally	Maybank	Walsh
Danaher	Mead	Wheeler
Davis	Millikin	Wherry
Eastland	Moore	Wiley
Ellender	Murdock	Willis
Ferguson	Murray	Wilson
George	Nye	
Gerry	O'Daniel	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. HILL, and Mr. CLARK of Missouri addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. HILL. It is my frank opinion that the mood of the Senate at this time is such that it is not best to try to legislate. I think the wisest thing to do would be to recess until tomorrow morning at 11 o'clock. I am confident that we may finish the pending bill if we now recess until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President—

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me for the purpose of making a motion?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate recess until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Alabama.

The motion was rejected.

Mr. BONE addressed the Chair.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Washington for a question.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I do not know who has the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina has the

floor. Does he yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. MAYBANK. I have yielded to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, allow me to assure the Senator from South Carolina that I want the floor in my own right, and that I wish to say something about the pending bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina has yielded. The Senator may proceed.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I have yielded to the Senator from Washington for a question.

Mr. BONE. I do not desire to quiz my brother.

Mr. MAYBANK. Will the Senator from Washington advise me why he wishes me to yield?

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I wish to obtain the floor in my own right.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I yield the floor to the Senator from Washington. [Laughter.]

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I am happy to observe that all has suddenly become sweetness and light, and I hope I shall pierce the gloom surrounding my colleagues like a gleam of celestial sunshine in what I am about to say.

Mr. President, I was mightily moved by the observations of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. I tried in my own way to follow him, because I am an earnest seeker after the truth, and I would not have missed any of the gems of wisdom from the Senator from Nebraska.

I was more than interested in the statement of the Senator about rugged individualism, and I recall—and if I am in error I hope some Senator will correct me—that the R. A. C. C. provision was enacted in 1932, in the era of rugged individualism. It had become so rugged that it was kicking the tail feathers off the very businessmen for whom the Senator from Nebraska now speaks, and they were going broke in my section of the country at a rate which was astounding, to say the least. It was the end of the era of rugged individualism which the Senator so staunchly defends here this afternoon, and if any of the rugged individualism had continued very much longer, there would not have been even a capitalist system left in the United States.

The law was put on the statute books, not by new dealers, but by the Hoover administration, which makes it very interesting to find a good, stanch Republican assailing it today as something which might lead to something very bad, perhaps to communism.

It so happens that the R. A. C. C. today, and for some years past, has only been operating in a couple of sections of the country, around Minneapolis, and in my own State in what is known as the Wenatchee section, which is one of the great apple-growing sections of the United States.

Mr. TOBEY. It is only second to the southern section of New Hampshire, if I am correct.

Mr. BONE. I should be heartbroken if New Hampshire got into the picture as an apple-producing State. I know it has

produced many fine things, but I did not know it was much of an apple-producing State.

Mr. President, in the gloomy days of the depression the bankers the Senator from Nebraska talks about let the apple producers in my State down with a dull thud, and in 1938, in one of the greatest crises that has ever stricken any section of the country, those apple growers were going to hell in a hand basket financially, and losing their homes, and when the bankers would not come to their help, I, with my colleague in the Senate and my friends in the House, utilized every agency of this Government to keep them alive, and today they are barely prosperous, but they still need the assistance which the R. A. C. C. has given them.

The Senator from Nebraska has conjured up a Frankenstein monster, some great gargantuan thing to affright us, but he has made a mountain out of a mole hill. Last year R. A. C. C. loaned the apple growers of Washington—and they are the salt of the earth—\$8,000,000, and it has all been paid back. What is wrong with that program? In God's name, what is wrong with it?

The Senator says there is no crisis. In the name of all that is reasonable, what are we facing today? No nation in all the endless cycles of time ever faced anything half so grave as this crisis, and all Senators know it.

What do you call this kind of a war, which shakes the very foundations of western civilization? Do you not call it a crisis? Yet the Senator wants to bury or cremate this law, drive it off the statute books, put it out of business, although as I understand from his statement, he implies that it will not put the R. A. C. C. out of business. The provision is:

That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay the compensation of anybody engaged in making loans.

What would be the effect of that provision? I do not think there is a lawyer in this body with nerve enough to rise and say that it would not effect the death of the thing. If the advice of my friend from Nebraska is followed, we decree the death of R. A. C. C., and make no mistake about it. Let us be frank about it. It would simply blot it out. He quoted my friend Bert Goss, of the Grange. I understand the Senator from Nebraska is not a lawyer.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BONE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I am a lawyer, and I say that the adoption of section 2 would have nothing to do with whether or not R. A. C. C. would continue to function.

Mr. BONE. I listened to the Senator very intently, and tried to follow him, and I do not find myself in agreement with him.

He quoted Mr. Albert Goss, of the Grange. I suggest that he did what lawyers frequently do—that is, quote a part of the testimony. Mr. Goss was asked whether it would not be better to abolish R. A. C. C., and to that question he answered:

We doubt if this is the most constructive solution.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BONE. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not wish to interrupt the Senator from Washington, because I know his time is limited, but let me state the situation. The R. A. C. C. matter came before the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures. I looked into it, and I shall take occasion later to say why I looked into it with care. This provision does not abolish the R. A. C. C., it is still in existence, and it can be revived whenever there is any necessity for it.

Mr. BONE. I understand that the provision does not abolish it, just by blotting it out, but it says that no part of the appropriation in this bill can be used to pay anybody connected with making loans under it.

Mr. GEORGE. Why should it be?

Mr. BONE. Somebody has to process these loans.

Mr. GEORGE. Has not the R. A. C. C. money?

Mr. BONE. Yes; but it has to hire someone to do the work in making the loans.

Mr. GEORGE. That is just the point, they have not the gall to hire 3,000 or 5,000 men at a time when there is no emergency and no occasion to use the R. A. C. C. That is all there is to it. They want to borrow the personnel from other agencies of the Government. I am assuring the Senator of that now, because there is no one trying to abolish it. It will not be abolished. It can still be revived whenever there is an occasion for it to make any loans. In my opinion an appropriation of money to pay people to do something cannot be justified where those who have the funds in hand are not willing to face the criticism of the country and pay the money out of their own funds.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, much as I admire my able colleague from Georgia, I cannot bring myself to agree with his conclusion that there is no great emergency, no crisis. I perhaps go as far as any Member of the Senate in believing that this country faces a supreme crisis in the production of food, and anything we can do today to stimulate the production of food—and certainly the R. A. C. C. has achieved it in my State—is something well worth doing.

I wish to go back for an instant, because I mentioned the matter only in passing. In the year 1938 the banking groups in my State were not making loans to the apple farmers—and the apple business is a vitally important business in my State—but were very bitter and very critical of the Federal Government for stepping into the picture and extending credit to the farmers in the apple business. So a warm friend of mine who was present at a certain meeting said, "The bankers do not like this program of Federal credit." Then he said, "I will have my friend HOMER BONE wire the Government in Washington and ask the Federal Government to step out of this credit picture and turn over the whole function of lending to these farmers to private banking interests, and I will send that telegram to—"

night, put it right on the wires and send it to Washington." When he put that up, cold turkey, what do you think the bankers out there did? They did precisely as my colleagues suspect; they said, "Oh, no; let the Government continue this loaning activity."

Mr. President, the apple growers are getting into better shape. They are creating a credit of their own which will soon amount to one-half million dollars.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. BONE. I do not have very much time.

Mr. EASTLAND. I shall take but a moment.

Mr. BONE. Very well.

Mr. EASTLAND. I wish the Record to show that there was no yea-and-nay vote had on the committee amendment providing for the purchase of land for farm tenants, which appears on page 93 of the bill, beginning in line 6. I wish the Record to show that I voted for the appropriation for the purchase of farm lands by worthy individual tenants to make them home owners, as provided in the bill, with the safeguards against collectivism as provided therein.

Mr. BONE. Let me say this, Mr. President, and I say it because I am attempting on this floor to defend some very decent people, because I do not want to see them crucified even to satisfy the tempestuous feelings of my friend the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] that a group of farmers who will borrow \$8,000,000 and pay it back all out within a year are a darned good credit risk. That certainly does not represent communism.

When my friend the Senator from Nebraska read off the list of Government agencies I did not know whether he was starting to read a list of the members of the New York Stock Exchange or not. We have 10,000 private enterprises all levying tribute upon agriculture. But the farmers in the Wenatchee Valley are not parasitical fungus growths on the body social. They are raising a fund by taking 2 cents a box on each box of apples sold. They have nearly one-half million dollars in that fund. The businessmen there are putting approximately \$35,000 into the fund. In a little while they will have nearly \$1,000,000 in cold cash to sweeten the pot, and then the Federal Government can step out of the picture. But is the Senate going to decree the death of this program in the Wenatchee Valley simply because my friend the Senator from Nebraska does not like it?

I will say to the Senate that there is some degree of responsibility here, and I repeat what the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] said earlier today, that if Senators wish to create bitterness in the country let them go right ahead with the program of cutting off the little fellows. We might as well be perfectly frank and not kid ourselves, Senators, as we go toddling down this pathway of legislation, for we are headed into some tempests—make no mistake about it.

There is a great deal of misunderstanding about what is going on. There is a great emotional and intellectual

ferment in this country, but God help us if we ever pull the props out from under the average little fellow. If he has any guts, he will never take it again. If he is a real American, he will not go through what he went through under the Hoover administration. If he is true to the traditions of his grandsires, he will not go hungry or allow his family to go hungry in a nation whose potentialities for production are what ours happen to be at this time. We must protect the home front here while the war is going on.

Mr. President, this Chamber has resounded day after day with messages about the grim necessity of producing more food for America. We must feed our people here at home or else have a panic. Anything that will stimulate, that will help the producers of food, is much to be desired. We are not giving these people charity.

What do Senators think this is? Does my friend the Senator from Nebraska think this is charity, that he would fling charity to these people like he would fling a bone to a hungry dog? It is a strongly Republican district that my friend the Senator from Nebraska is talking about, and I am glad he raised the issue on this floor. I hate to mention any aspect of partisanship, but the cold record now stands, and if the agency under consideration is destroyed, it will have been destroyed at the insistence of a good conservative Republican, and let that be a matter of record.

I do not like to emphasize these things, Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). The time of the Senator from Washington on the amendment has expired.

Mr. BONE. I will take a little more time on the bill.

Mr. President, there is too much of the record to go through to justify me in attempting to review the whole history of the R. A. C. C. What is there about it that invites all this wrath? The agency existed for only a couple of years, and then in 1934 it subsided. Why was it revived, and how, in the last 2 or 3 years? It was revived when we got into the war. It was revived because there was a fear in the hearts of the men who were motivating this program that we would need to give more assistance to the producers.

When objection is made to the number of lending agencies which exists it reminds me of a person who objects to the number of banks which exist in a town. He might say, "Why in the dickens can we not have simply 1 bank instead of having 4 or 5 in this town?" If any one were to suggest such a thing he would immediately hear a defense of sturdy individualism, rugged individualism, and rugged business in America. Those who would make the defense would say that anyone has a right to go into the lending business, and that we can have 1 bank or 50 banks in a town if we wish. But, Mr. President, if we happen to have more than 1 organization in our governmental set-up which happen to render assistance to agriculture, and the organizations are divided

into regional divisions, we find men crying against them and inveighing against them.

Mr. President, I do not like the idea of so many agencies. I should like to see many of them brought together. But this is not the time to destroy an agency which is functioning in only two sections of the country. The record does not show, and my friend, the Senator from Nebraska, did not point out, that the Government was losing any money by reason of these loans.

The banks of the Wenatchee Valley section of my State have telegraphed me and urged me, HOMER BONE, to stand on the floor of the Senate and defend the R. A. C. C. program in my State, and in order that I might accomplish that purpose I have prepared an amendment, in case the Senate, by what I would call improvident action, should reject the amendment prepared by the Appropriations Committee, and refuse to accept its dictum.

Mr. President, that is all I want to say on the subject. Other Senators wish to speak on it. But I say to the Senate that Senators cannot predicate their vote or their attitude of mind on a theory that we do not confront a crisis in food production. Senators on both sides of the aisle have stood up in this Chamber and said we will confront a crisis in food. Men are saying the same thing on the radio all the time. Senators will take upon their souls a considerable responsibility if they vote now to cripple or destroy any agency whose expenditures, contrasted with war expenditures—

Are as moonlight unto sunlight, and as water unto wine.

They amount to nothing then. Literally they are the cube root of nothing.

Mr. President, I looked at one report today with respect to the number of persons employed in the Government. I think it was put out in connection with the McKellar bill. Of the 1,300,000 employees, 703,000 are in the Army and the Navy. That reduces tremendously the total number of employees. Probably 55 percent of all the employees engaged in the service of war and the making of war have nothing to do with normal governmental operations. They have nothing to do with any of our fiscal operations. Fifty-five percent of them are engaged in the grim business of war, which means the shedding of blood for the protection of the country. We have this food job confronting us at home, and if we let the food production of the country break down, if we permit ourselves the luxury of assailing some food-producing instrumentality by weakening its power to preserve itself, we shall have to answer, not only to the country, but to our own consciences.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I shall renew my request, since it is manifest that consideration of the bill cannot be concluded at any reasonable hour tonight, that the Senate recess until tomorrow at 11 o'clock. I state very frankly that I wish to discuss the pending amendment. It is especially important to the Democratic Party; because if the Democratic Party is going to commit itself to legislation of this kind

at a time when the banks of the country are literally bursting with money, the Democratic Party will have a very poor record with which to go before the country in 1944; and I do not want to see that done.

Therefore, Mr. President, I am asking that the further consideration of the bill go over until tomorrow morning—a request I never would have suggested, and would not urge now, if it were not apparent that we cannot reach an end to the consideration of the bill at an early hour.

I conferred with the Senator from Alabama, and he assured me that he was going to offer his amendment which would involve a motion to suspend the rule. In that event, we would get into the field of unlimited debate again, and I know we would not be able to reach a final vote on the bill until very, very late tonight.

Therefore, desiring to discuss the amendment briefly, I asked that the matter go over until tomorrow morning.

I now renew my request that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning. I should be perfectly agreeable to having a recess taken until 10 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, let me state again that I should yield to the wishes of the able Senator from Georgia, the Senator in charge of the bill. If I felt that by meeting at 10 o'clock in the morning we could have some reasonable assurance that we would conclude consideration of the bill tomorrow, I should not object to the request.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, the Committee on Banking and Currency is holding hearings on the bill providing for extension of the Commodity Credit Corporation's activities, and also is holding hearings on the question of subsidy payments in working out a roll-back arrangement. At the request of Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, we have arranged for a meeting tomorrow, and have agreed to hear him at 10:30 a. m. Of course, the next day is Saturday. If we shall be able to conclude consideration of the bill tomorrow—and I believe we shall be, with the limitation of debate—I should like very much to be able to comply with both obligations: To be in the committee meeting, and also to be present at the session of the Senate.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I should like to go through with the program. I have always endeavored to be reasonable and to yield to the wishes of the Senator in charge of a bill. If the agreement we made earlier in the day would include limitation of debate on motions, as well as limitation of debate on the bill and on amendments thereto, I think it would be agreeable to have the Senate recess until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if we can have an understanding as to limitation on motions which might be made on the bill, as well as on amendments and on the bill itself, I think we might make more progress by recessing at this time until tomorrow.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. President, those of us on this side of the Chamber are very much interested in what is going on. We are not able to hear. Will the Senator please repeat his statement?

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall endeavor to lift my voice; I was not aware that I was talking in a lower tone than usual. I should be glad to stay here tonight if I thought there was any possibility of concluding consideration of the bill tonight. I do not like to tire Senators. If we can obtain an agreement about limitation throughout, I think we might as well recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock. A number of Members of the Senate do not want to have the Senate meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning. Unless some unforeseen developments occur, we shall be able to conclude consideration of the bill tomorrow; and if its consideration is concluded tomorrow, the time at which the conclusion of its consideration is reached will not make a great deal of difference.

However, I wish to say that if tomorrow there develops some unforeseen situation which would carry us into the late hours of the afternoon, I shall insist that the Senate remain in session until consideration of the bill is concluded. The time in which the bill must be enacted into law is growing very short. In previous years we have been in conference on agricultural appropriation bills for as long as 2 months without being able to reach an agreement on all the matters at variance between the two Houses.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a limitation to apply to all motions as well as to all amendments and to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I did not understand the request.

Mr. RUSSELL. I asked unanimous consent that the limitation on debate be construed to apply to all motions as well as to the bill and to amendments thereto.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That would mean 15 minutes and 15 minutes, would it?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct. In that event, no Senator could speak more than once, or for more than 15 minutes, on the bill or on any amendment or motion, with the understanding that the total time allotted to any one Senator would not be more than 30 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection—

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, will the Chair state what we are now asked to consent to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia has requested unanimous consent that the 15-minute limitation be extended to all motions affecting the bill. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, are we asked to act now on the motion of the Senator from Georgia that the Senate recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; the Senator from Georgia has not made such a motion.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the announcement made at the beginning of the session today by the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama included only a limitation of debate to 15 minutes on the amendments. A moment ago I suggested—and request is now being made—that motions be included in that agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate has just agreed to the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. McNARY. I did not so understand. A question was asked. Has the Senate agreed to the unanimous-consent request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No objection was made.

Mr. McNARY. Very well. Mr. President, I suggest that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I hope that suggestion will be followed. I wonder if we could not include in the agreement with reference to the time of convening tomorrow an agreement as to the time for taking the final vote on the bill—for instance, to have the final vote on the bill taken at 5 o'clock or 5:30. If that were agreed to, we should have arranged for the whole program.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, in order to comply with the Senator's suggestion, it would be necessary to have a quorum call tonight. A quorum call would not be required in connection with voting on a motion or on an amendment; but if action is to be taken on final passage of the bill, a quorum call would be required tonight. I, myself, can see no objection to having the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I suggest that the hour of meeting be made 11:30 tomorrow morning.

Mr. McNARY. No; 11 o'clock.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a number of Senators are affected by this matter. Now that we have a limitation as to the length of debate, I think it will be possible to conclude consideration of the bill tomorrow. My suggestion is that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, is it the suggestion of the Senator from Georgia that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock tomorrow?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. I was expressing the hope that it would be agreeable to the Senate to recess until 12 o'clock tomorrow. That would be agreeable to me. With the limitation on debate, I think it would be possible to have the Senate conclude consideration of the bill if it convened at 12 o'clock tomorrow. A number of Senators who are interested in the pending matter have expressed the hope that the hour of meeting tomorrow would be 12 o'clock.

Mr. McNARY. I shall defer most reluctantly. I do not see why one committee which is to meet in order to hear Mr. Green or anyone else should determine the course of action which the Senate should take.

Mr. RUSSELL. I will say that more considerations are involved in my suggestion than the one referred to by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. McNARY. I think the matter should be left as suggested. I shall object to having the Senate meet at 12 o'clock.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, let me ask what is the suggestion of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Unless something unforeseen develops, I think it will be possible for the Senate to conclude consideration of the bill by meeting at 12 o'clock tomorrow.

RECESS

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I offer a substitute motion that the time of meeting on tomorrow be 11 o'clock a. m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the substitute motion of the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, what is the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama has moved that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock tomorrow. The Senator from New Hampshire has made a substitute motion that the Senate meet at 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow. The question is on agreeing to the substitute motion.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, what is the objection to meeting at 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow so that we may have full assurance of being able to complete consideration of the bill? We have been meeting at 11 o'clock.

Mr. RUSSELL. Not on the pending bill.

Mr. McNARY. But we have been meeting at 11 o'clock for the consideration of other bills not as pressing as the pending bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have made some commitments to Senators who are absent from the floor at this time that, insofar as I was concerned, I should be willing to have the Senate meet tomorrow at 12 o'clock. Probably those Senators have relied upon that assurance in making their arrangements to return to the city.

On my part, I prefer to have the Senate meet at 12 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. McNARY. Of course, Mr. President, if the Senator has made commitments, that is a different matter. But, for my part, I should be glad to have the Senate meet at 11 o'clock a. m.

Mr. RUSSELL. The suggestion to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. was made only in the last few minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair calls attention to the fact that the motion is not debatable.

The question is on agreeing to the substitute motion of the Senator from New Hampshire that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 11 o'clock.

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama that

the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 8 o'clock p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, June 11, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JUNE 10, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, the God of our fathers, be near us when we call and answer us when we pray, and when Thou hearest, forgive. There are truths that he who runs may read; there are deeper truths which come only to those who wait and meditate in Thy holy presence. Unfold these, we pray, that we may feel Thy sacred nearness and be led by the fullness of Thy wisdom. In the secret of Thy fellowship, in the depths of soul, preserve us from idle reverie, from the spirit of petulance, from superficial judgment and from the gnawing fragments of self-pity.

We praise Thee for the strength of the life of faith. O may the great crises of today serve to bind us to something beyond the vain, empty repetitions of this world. Dear Lord, give us courage to identify ourselves with every cause of human need, where sorrow cannot wholly rise, whatever the denial or honor it may involve. Fill us with the understanding that the world belongs to him who wills, who knows and prays, trustfully walking with Thee whose ways are paths of peace. In our dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agency:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of the Navy.
3. Executive Office of the President (War Manpower Commission).

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1563) entitled "An act authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain auxiliary vessels for the United States Navy, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the

joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following department:

Department of Agriculture.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH AND JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2409) making appropriations for the legislative branch and for the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. O'NEAL, HENDRICKS, GORE, KIRWAN, JOHNSON of Indiana, H. CARL ANDERSEN, and FLOESER.

WOMEN LAWMAKERS

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to an article by John O'Donnell in the Times-Herald of June 9, under the caption "Capitol Stuff," in which he quotes a "lady lawmaker." An anonymous statement or letter is always the resort of a coward.

As dean of the women in Congress, I resent this filthy article and believe it to be an unwarranted, contemptible, cowardly attack on all women lawmakers and other women as well. My colleagues in the House are representative of the highest type of womanhood. I know none would author the statement quoted in the article referred to. Nor do I believe Mrs. Hobby would be a party to what is described as a "super secret agreement," reached by the high ranking officers of the War Department. The loose talk that has been indulged in recently concerning our women in the armed service can be nothing less than Nazi-inspired propaganda to frighten the mothers and relatives of young women who have volunteered and those who are considering service in the armed forces.

The issue is not, as he describes it, one of "religion, honor, politics, and medicine," but of decency and morality. I know a great many exceptionally fine, highly qualified young girls serving in difficult positions in the Army, Navy, and marines who could be enjoying every comfort at home had they been less patriotic and more selfish. I know the attacks that have been made on them will be resented by every fair-minded person from one end of the country to the other.

Mr. O'Donnell is doing a great disservice to our country by writing such stuff. If he cannot put on a uniform and serve his country, he should not slander those

who are doing so. I am surprised that a reputable newspaper would publish such filth.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I deeply deplore the article referred to by the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORRIS]. She has checked with the women legislators. I have checked also. No woman legislator made any such statement as is reported in Mr. O'Donnell's column.

It is difficult for me to understand why such things are published today, why there is a whispering and an open campaign of statements against the decency and honor of the women of the United States. It is directed not only against the women in the armed forces really, but against women in industry and in agriculture. There is an underlying attack on all women in this country. There is no doubt in my mind—and I have gone into it quite fully and shall continue to go into it—that there is an effort to discredit the splendid women of our country. Nothing would please Hitler more than to do that.

If we ever allow the people of the other nations of the world, or anyone in our own country, to say or believe things about our women that will ruin the whole structure of our great country.

The men of the United States I have always believed to be the most decent, the most honorable of the men of any nation of the world, and I know that each and every one of you would have the deepest resentment against any person who made slanderous remarks about your wife, or your daughter, or your sister. Also I am sure that you will do everything you can to stop this insidious, more than insidious, this open campaign that tends to destroy the faith in the women of our country.

LIDICE

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, this is June 10, which is the first anniversary of the murder of a village by the Nazis—a murder boastfully proclaimed to the world by them—and which is dedicated by the United States and all the United Nations to remembering.

The thing that we should remember and will remember is a little road leading down a gentle slope to a little village in a valley. It was springtime, and the air was fragrant with blossoms. About 90 roofs clustered about the spire of a church. This was Lidice.

For over 600 years these little cottages, these outlying farms had been handed down from father to son; about 400 people lived there; children played there; men worked there at farming, metal work, and mining. It was a small, happy, ordinary village—remote, peaceful.

Then one night the Nazis came. They came in their stamping boots and brown shirts.

Only one man lives today to tell the story of what happened in Lidice on that ghastly night. He hid in a hole outside the village when the Nazis came. He heard the screaming of the women and the children, the rattling of machine guns, after that the terrible sounds—then the rumble of heavily loaded motor trucks, the bleating of a human herd being driven on the highway. Later he heard the roar of explosives, blast after blast. Then, creeping from his shelter, he saw his village ablaze—all of it.

What he heard was the shooting, before the eyes of their wives, mothers, children, sweethearts, and grandchildren of 200 men, including an old man of 82; and the driving off of the women and children into concentration camps and correction schools.

Mr. Speaker, other villages have suffered a fate similar to Lidice—Polish, Yugoslav, Chinese villages. But in no other case has the murderer boasted of his crime. Lidice remains forever the flaming example of Nazi self-confessed atrocity.

Now, a year later, as we of the United Nations unload our bombs on Duesseldorf, Berlin, Essen, Dortmund, on Mannheim, we are remembering Lidice.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] be granted leave of absence for the remainder of the week, because of serious illness in the family.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein an article from the Christian Century.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include an editorial from the New Republic concerning the Chinese exclusion law.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

(Mr. LAMBERTSON asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the Record.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the Office of Price Administration has just started its roll-back program with a subsidy. So that they might make it a little more ridiculous than they could otherwise do they have placed a subsidy upon coffee. The wholesale price of coffee a year ago was 13 cents a pound. Today in this morning's paper the wholesale price of

coffee is carried at 13 cents a pound. What common sense can there be in this unless it is as indicated in this article from the New York Herald Tribune of June 3:

Frank Russell gets Potter's Office of Price Administration job here. Coffee and sugar exchange official will head New York district office of price agency.

This thing is getting to be an awful mess. The further the Office of Price Administration goes with subsidies and the further they attempt to adopt some system which continues to muddle up the price and rationing situation in this country, just so long as they do that the situation is going to get worse and worse. It is time it stopped.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein a resolution by the Arkansas Press Association.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, June 14, after the conclusion of the legislative business of the day and other special orders, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein an article by Merlo Pusey appearing in the Washington Post of June 8.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein an editorial from the Galveston News on the public debt.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein statements having relevancy to H. R. 2536.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

TEMPORARY ADDITIONAL PAY FOR RURAL LETTER CARRIERS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BURCH].

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 2080) to provide temporary additional pay for equipment maintenance for each carrier in Rural Mail Delivery Service.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, do I understand that this increases the

pay of mail carriers from 5 to 6 cents a mile?

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. That is correct.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And is this bill recommended by the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads and by the Post Office Department?

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. It comes to the floor with a unanimous report of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads and it is approved by the Post Office Department.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It is approved by both and it is unanimous?

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. It is unanimous.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That each carrier in Rural Mail Delivery Service shall be paid for equipment maintenance a sum equal to 1 cent per mile per day for each mile or major fraction of a mile scheduled in addition to the 5 cents per mile per day for each mile or major fraction of a mile scheduled as now provided by law. Payments for the additional equipment maintenance as provided herein shall be at the same periods and in the same manner as payments for regular compensation to rural carriers.

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 3. This act shall take effect May 1, 1943, and shall remain in effect for the duration of the war and for 6 months thereafter, or until such earlier date as Congress by concurrent resolution may prescribe.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 7, strike out all of section 3 and insert a new section 3 as follows:

"Sec. 3. This act shall take effect immediately upon its enactment, and shall terminate June 30, 1945, or such earlier date as the Congress may by concurrent resolution prescribe."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CAPITOL NOW OPEN TO SERVICEMEN ON SUNDAYS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

COMMERCIAL FEEDING DIFFICULTIES

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include some recommendations from the canning industry.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. Gross addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

CANNOT CONTROL PRICES SATISFACTORILY WITHOUT FREEZING EXCESS PURCHASING POWER

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] brought up a very interesting point about confusion concerning prices. We will have more problems concerning prices until we do something about the excess purchasing power. I am not attempting to defend any confusion or rules or regulations that are not reasonable or logical. In England, we are told, they have a very small office to control prices. The same is true in Canada. But in England and Canada they siphon off so much of the purchasing power from the people through taxes. The people do not have the money to buy with that we have here, therefore they do not have that pressure and that competition for the purchase of goods that we have here. Unless we place taxes on this excess purchasing power and unless possibly we have forced savings or do something to drain this excess purchasing power off, our problems regarding prices are going to increase.

RESPONSIBILITY HERE IN CONGRESS

The President asked the Congress to put on \$16,000,000,000 additional taxes, which would have drained off a lot of this excess purchasing power, but Congress did not do that. Instead, Congress passed a bill which had the effect of forgiving seven or eight billion dollars instead of passing a bill providing for \$16,000,000,000 additional taxes. So the responsibility right now for many of these problems, in my opinion, is right here in Congress.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY] may be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include an address which he made.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER]?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE TO ESCORT PRESIDENT OF PARAGUAY INTO HOUSE CHAMBER

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as a committee to escort the President of Paraguay into the House Chamber the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM], and the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess, subject to the call of the Speaker.

During the recess the following occurred:

The President of Paraguay and his party entered the Chamber at 12 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m., and the President of Paraguay was escorted to the Speaker's rostrum by the committee of Representatives appointed for that purpose.

The SPEAKER. Members of the House of Representatives, it gives me unusual pleasure to have the privilege of presenting our guest on this occasion. He comes from a sister republic in South America, from a people who for more than 100 years have been a liberty-loving, brave, and fighting people. They have maintained their freedom in an atmosphere of hostility many times. They are still a free and a great people.

It gives me great pleasure, therefore, to present to you the head of that great government, the President of the Republic of Paraguay.

The PRESIDENT OF PARAGUAY. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House of Representatives, the magnificence of the Capitol is fitting to shelter within its gigantic walls the outstanding figures of the illustrious persons whose statues stand in the rotunda as mute guardians of the imperishable traditions of this House, from which has emanated the wise democratic legislation that has exercised such marked influence on the material and spiritual progress of this great Nation.

It signifies a high honor for me to occupy this rostrum, not only as President of your sister nation but above all as a citizen of the Americas, as a member of the great family of nations united around a common cause.

The United States of America entered into an independent life on the basis of a well defined program that appears in the Declaration of Independence of 1776, completed later by the Constitution and by the Bill of Rights and the Gettysburg Address.

The Declaration of Independence is, in my opinion, the most transcendental document of its kind. It begins with the enunciation of the fine international juridical principle according to which "the separate and equal station of the nations of the world is a right to which the laws of Nature and of Nature's God entitle them"; it proclaims in the public order "that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights—that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness"; and it establishes in political matters one of the cardinal principles of democratic regimes: "That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." Since the memorable date of that Jeffersonian declaration more than 166 years have passed, and still those principles continue to be the foundation stones of the juridical structure of the free people.

Thirteen years before the French Revolution, the United States of America had

set forth the principles of the Bill of Rights, which later served as a model to the new nations of the great American family in the framing of their constitutions.

My country, together with the other countries of America, and following the example of the older sister to the north, adopted a democratic form of government. It has been and is a democratic country since the early days of its history. Paraguayan in origin was the revolution of the Comuneros, which in 1727, long before the middle of the eighteenth century, proclaimed to the whole world that the will of the common people must be above all other wills, as a principle which belongs to public authority.

Up till 1939 Paraguay had governed itself by one of the most liberal constitutions in the world.

The new questions which arose in the field of pure law inspired the reform of 1939, in order to place that fundamental law in harmony with the modern conquest of law; and assure a greater well-being. The problem was not stated with a view to abandoning the road followed up to then and traveling by a different one, but with a view to modifying the direction and trying to expedite it in a convenient way, leaving out obstacles and illusions, in accordance with the modern ideologies, and in line with the processes that other American countries had established. It has not followed any absolutist tendency, but the sound purpose of satisfying a need without impairing, as stated in the declaration of purposes, the cardinal principles of American democracy contained in the Philadelphia Constitution.

There is no doubt that the democratic system, as a political and social organization, is the only one which conforms with man's nature; but it is also true that any system or body or doctrine can and must be modified in the light of truth without removing, of course, the bases of the juridical structure so that it may not err by trying to operate in a vacuum. "The inquiry, knowledge, and belief of truth," as stated in an inscription in the facade of the central gallery of the Library of Congress, "is the sovereign good of human nature."

I do not need to state that we are not dealing with a finished work. Rather, I believe in the reform of its flaws and omissions. That is why I have advocated recently its revision, after consulting my people with favorable results, and always considering the basic principles of a true democracy.

In the chronological division of universal history, the contemporary age starts with the French Revolution. The fair thing in my opinion would have been to take as the starting point the date of the independence of the United States of America, of the approval, by the Second Continental Congress, of the outstanding statements to which I have just referred, at least in America, where the seed of liberty has sprouted into institutions which honor the peoples that are a part of the American community and that live under the same civic preoccupation and the same common aspirations.

In the light of events in the United States during the past 10 years, it may not be unreasonable to state that a new era in history has begun in the New World. Let me review but two of these events:

First, the inception of the good-neighbor policy, coincidental with the inauguration of President Roosevelt, who from the rostrum of this Capitol said that in the field of international relations he dedicated this Nation to the good neighbor who respects himself and who, therefore, respects the rights of others; the neighbor who, in a world of neighbors, honors his obligations and the sanctity of his word.

And, second, the consolidation of pan-Americanism, from the first meeting of foreign ministers in Panama in 1939 to the third such meeting, in Rio de Janeiro in 1942, the immediate result of which was the most magnificent cooperation of the American countries ever recorded in history, for the purpose of defending themselves against the common danger which struck against them with the treacherous attack on Pearl Harbor, of struggling for the maintenance of the undying principles of liberty and justice which govern their living together, and of aiming at the formation of a world better than the present one on the basis of respect for the principles of ethics and law and of the practice of a true fraternity, as principles essential to a democracy.

Paraguay has kept and will continue to keep faithfully and honorably all her international pledges. Even before the third meeting of foreign ministers in Rio had come to a close, she had broken all diplomatic, economic, and financial ties with the Axis.

Respectful of her tradition and an active advocate of the principles expressed, she has not hesitated a single moment to put herself on the side of the United States and the other United Nations in the greatest tragedy which the imagination has conceived and which history has recorded in all time.

The Paraguayan people reaffirm, through me, on this solemn occasion, their adherence to the cause of this glorious country, which is also the cause of all America, and pays homage to the heroism of its brave fighting men in the fight for liberty and justice.

At 12 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m., the President of Paraguay and his party departed.

AFTER THE RECESS

The recess having expired, at 1 o'clock and 1 minute p. m., the House was called to order by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the proceedings occurring in the Chamber during the recess of the House will be printed in the Record.

There was no objection.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1943

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2536) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the pro-

motion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment," approved June 2, 1920, as amended, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2536, with Mr. GORE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill, as its title states, is a bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment."

By reference to the first page of the report you can see something of the history of this bill. The subject has been under consideration for approximately 2 years. The first bill introduced was H. R. 5906. Some study was given that bill. Then H. R. 7484 was introduced and extensive hearings were held on it by a subcommittee. Following that, the committee decided to use the information gained at that hearing and introduced H. R. 699. On that bill we held additional hearings. At the close of the hearings and the consideration of that bill, which covered a period of approximately 3 months of executive sessions and discussions, I introduced the bill H. R. 2536, which is sometimes referred to as the "clean" bill, since it comes to the floor without the necessity of having a great number of clarifying amendments.

May I say this at the outset. During my stay in this House I have never known of a piece of legislation receiving more careful consideration by a committee than this. There was never the slightest tinge of partisanship in the committee room. The bill is truly a committee bill. When reported out, it was reported by a unanimous vote of the committee. One member of the committee suggested that he might want to reserve the right to offer an amendment, but the bill was reported with the unanimous approval of the Committee on Education.

I shall not burden the House by going into a detailed discussion of the various provisions of the bill, but it is decidedly an improvement over the basic act, which has been in operation for approximately 23 years. During that time those in charge of its administration have built up a reputation that I think should be regarded by this House as quite commendable. They have been handling about 50,000 cases a year, and at the present time they are handling 75,000 cases, I think. The cost of rehabilitation is a little under \$300 per individual, as compared with the first attempt made in rehabilitation following the World War, when the cost ran up to approximately \$5,000 per case.

The administration of this act is in the Office of Education, which by Executive order was placed under the Federal Security Administrator. It may be interesting to you to know that the en-

tire personnel in the Washington headquarters office, to handle this entire program, consists of 22 people. I think Dr. Kratz, the head of this bureau, is entitled to that statement.

In this bill we attempt to provide and do provide for the rehabilitation of the industrial injured, the non-service-connected veterans, the civil air patrol and the merchant marine, and the congenitally disabled, the whole theory of the bill being that if a blind person is rehabilitated to the extent that he can earn a living he not only becomes a better citizen but he goes off the Government pay roll, so to speak, because the United States Government pays blind benefits.

As to those who are injured and crippled in industries, under this program we can make them better citizens, enable them to take care of their families, and eventually create a saving to the Federal Government as well as the State governments and society in general.

The service-connected veterans were taken care of in Public 16, a law passed by this Congress sometime ago. When this bill was originally introduced, it carried a section which provided for a cooperative arrangement for the handling of service-connected veterans. This provision was carried in H. R. 7484 and in H. R. 699. Then the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation considered a bill which was virtually section 1 of H. R. 699 and reported it to the House, and it became a law. We struck that section out of this bill, but in Public 16 was incorporated this provision:

The Administrator . . . may utilize and extend existing Veterans' Administration facilities and utilize those of any other governmental agency as well as those maintained by joint Federal and State contribution.

This program is maintained by Federal and State joint contributions, and is the set-up referred to.

In this bill, therefore, we make the service available to the Veterans' Administration at his discretion when the agreements are made.

There is another feature to this bill. The service-connected disabled veterans constitute only about 10 percent of the veterans needing rehabilitation. Therefore it becomes highly important and necessary that this act and these facilities be made available. The veterans are already returning, and may I say right here that this department is the only governmental agency that has been or is now taking care of the rehabilitation of the veterans. However, the Veterans' Administration is as rapidly as possible setting up the machinery to take care of the service-connected veterans under Public Act 16, but I might mention in that connection that, as is well known, there will be many veterans who have service connections but who will not be declared service connected for some time to come. As a matter of fact they are still declaring some veterans service connected from the last World War. This bill provides the cooperative machinery to fit with the other bills, making a complete working law, just as we intended

in the original H. R. 699 with section 1 deleted. The 50-50 matching is in this bill. The State pays 50 cents of every dollar in the handling of the program, except the administrative cost, which is paid by the Federal Government. The management of the program is with the State vocational board, and in every State of the Union they have these boards set up, and the superintendent of education is usually the man who presides over the board. We have safeguarded every right to the States. We have said what kind of a State plan, and what the plan would really consist of, which shall be submitted to Washington, and when the State plan contains the provisions set up in this act, it is then approved in Washington.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. Yes.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Is there any provision where State institutions are concerned under which the rehabilitation of some of these defectives may be recognized under this act, as well as other institutions? For instance, our institutions for those who cannot see or speak or hear—

Mr. BARDEN. Yes.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. They can recognize that institution?

Mr. BARDEN. Yes; and utilize every facility in the State.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman is doing a very fine piece of work, and we are all indebted to him. I wish to ask a question with reference to what schools will be recognized in this rehabilitation program, in all of the categories. It is not confined to any particular branch of schools? Will they include our privately owned commercial schools?

Mr. BARDEN. Absolutely. That is exactly why the administrator has been able to keep this cost down to such a remarkably low figure. It is by utilizing the facilities that have been set up, in making contracts with them.

Mr. D'ALESSANDRO. The gentleman also will agree that the handling of the program will be for all physically disabled.

Mr. BARDEN. Why, of course.

Mr. D'ALESSANDRO. And the gentleman further states it does not affect privately owned schools.

Mr. BARDEN. No. I state to the gentleman in all frankness that I have received quite a lot of mail about this bill, and all that I have received from all of the privately owned schools throughout the country have contained praise and a prayer that it would soon become a law.

Mr. D'ALESSANDRO. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. Yes.

Mr. JENSEN. Do I understand that the soldiers of all wars receive equal treatment under this bill?

Mr. BARDEN. Absolutely. There is no distinction in this bill as to what war

one incurred an injury in or whether it was after the war.

Mr. MOTT. Is there any change between this bill and existing law as to the authority and jurisdiction of the Federal Government in regard to this program? Or, let me put the question in this way: Is as much authority left in the States under this bill as under existing law?

Mr. BARDEN. There is considerably more, and we have placed more safeguards around it. The basic act was a rather wide-open proposition. However, I may say that we had a very fine Administrator at the head, Dr. Kratz, who did not use even a small percentage of the power given him, and I say this to his credit, that it was at his suggestion that some of that power was taken out of Washington because he did not like to have power lying around, as somebody would be accusing him of using it.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. Yes.

Mr. HARE. Is there any limitation on the appropriations now applied to all this work?

Mr. BARDEN. I do not understand.

Mr. HARE. In the amount appropriated.

Mr. BARDEN. Certainly not. May I say to the gentleman that in the past years it has been costing around \$3,000,000—three to four million dollars. That is, the Federal share of it. I am informed that it will likely run to possibly ten or twelve million dollars in the light of the present industrial activity and of the war.

The gentleman would have to tell me how many people were going to be disabled and how many soldiers were going to need treatment before we could get at the amount of money.

Mr. HARE. I understand that heretofore the act provided for no limitation on the amount that could be appropriated by Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. BARDEN. I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. HARE. As I understand, heretofore there has been no limitation on the amount that could be appropriated by Congress for this purpose?

Mr. BARDEN. I think not.

Mr. HARE. This act does not contemplate any change in the policy?

Mr. BARDEN. No, it does not, if my memory is correct. I think it would be very unwise if we were to try to guess at the cost.

Mr. HARE. I was not expressing an opinion on the matter. I just wanted to be sure that there was no limitation.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. GRANGER. Has it been your experience that there has been no discrimination in the case of disabled veterans, where the States have not been able to comply with the requirement of the Federal Government as to furnishing training for them?

Mr. BARDEN. May I have the gentleman's question again? I did not understand it.

Mr. GRANGER. This is a 50-50 proposition between the States and the Government?

Mr. BARDEN. That is correct.

Mr. GRANGER. Has there been a case where a State has failed to take care of its veterans because it has not had the funds with which to do it?

Mr. BARDEN. Well, there have been some cases where the States have exhausted their appropriation and therefore had to cut their activities. But in view of the war and in view of the fact that all State legislatures are closed, we have placed a provision in this bill that where a State exhausts its money and it is necessary for the work to go on until the next session of the State legislature, that can be done.

In working on the physical-restoration feature of this bill we were exceptionally fortunate in having one member of the committee who held a fellowship in surgery at Mayos', and who had had 10 years in China, with a vast amount of experience in this field. That is the gentleman from Minnesota, Dr. Judd. His services on the committee, I think, were invaluable, and I am sure all members appreciated it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has again expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill does not present a new subject to the Congress of the United States. It is one that has been on the statute books and in operation for 20 years.

I want to take this opportunity to pay my respects—and I think I share the sentiments and opinion of all other members of the Committee on Education of the House of Representatives—to our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN]. He has led that committee in the consideration of this bill for over 5 months of deliberations. In all that time I can say without any fear of contradiction that no man in this House displayed greater patience, tolerance, and uniform courtesy to the members of the committee, no matter on which side of the table they sat, than the distinguished chairman of our committee [Mr. BARDEN].

When this bill first came to the committee for consideration it contained some 26 or 27 pages. The bill which we present to you today contains about 15 pages. The deletion is due largely to the fact that we struck out title I, which had to do with veterans' affairs and which subject was dealt with by another committee. If there was any one thing that challenged the attention of all members, it was to be sure that in the presentation of this legislation the rights of the States were protected.

I join in the opinion expressed by the chairman of the committee that this is a States' rights bill. The statute now on the books, as we all know, provides for a 50-50 matching of State and Federal funds. This bill does the same thing. No State is required to do anything under this bill unless it chooses to do so. The States inaugurate the program.

They include in it the plan they desire to carry out and the classes of persons which they desire to rehabilitate. When their plan is approved by the Federal Administrator, then it becomes the program of the State, and the State administers it. There is no change in the substance of the basic law, in my opinion, with one exception; that is, that in the present law the cost of administration is borne equally by the States and the Federal Government. In this bill the Federal Government pays the cost of administration.

It was thought by many members of the committee that that provision was fair to the States; that it did not confer upon the Federal Government any new authority, because the States submit their statements every 90 days to the Federal Government, and the Federal Government sends them a check.

Mr. Gwynne. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. Gwynne. Who selects the schools which participate in this program? Is that left to the States?

Mr. DONDERO. That is left entirely to the State boards of vocational rehabilitation, just as it is now. However, this program has very little to do with schools.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I prefer to finish my statement, and then I will yield to the gentleman.

This program of vocational rehabilitation is not a large one. During the last fiscal year the amount of money expended was approximately \$6,000,000; \$3,000,000 on the part of the Federal Government and \$3,000,000 on the part of the States. The question was raised how much larger this program would be under this bill, with limited physical restoration included. The estimate was \$12,000,000; \$6,000,000 on the part of the Federal Government, and an equal amount on the part of the States. Perhaps the best answer is that if we knew how long the war would last and how many would be injured as a result of the war, and in industry, we might better be able to answer the question with a greater degree of certainty and accuracy. That is not a large program. It is a very modest program, and one that will pay large dividends to the American taxpayer. Under the present law it amounted to about \$60,000 annually per State. That is a small amount of money. We have rehabilitated under the present law more than 200,000 cases. These people have become self-sustaining citizens and are taxpayers instead of tax eaters. The average cost per case has been \$300, and the Federal cost of administration is about 1½ percent.

I think the fact is worthy of repeating that the entire Federal program, here in the Nation's Capital, has been carried on and administered, including clerical help, by a staff of 22 people under the able, efficient, and economical supervision of Dr. Kratz, administrator of this program.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. My interest in this matter is whether or not there should be a limitation on the authorization. I am interested in that because I sit on the subcommittee which writes the appropriation bill which provides for this agency. I am very much in favor of this bill as a whole, but in all previous legislation as I understand on this subject a limitation has been fixed by the Congress as to the total amount which should be appropriated. In the act of July 2, 1920, there was a limitation of \$1,000,000 fixed; and in section 531 of the Social Security Act a limitation of \$3,500,000 was fixed.

I can appreciate the difficulty of determining just how much money will be needed to carry out the purposes of the program, but I do not like the idea of just knocking out the limitation entirely and leaving the sky as the limit. It seems to me that we ought to leave some limitation. The gentleman says \$6,000,000 is the estimate. Why not name \$7,500,000, or some other top figure beyond which the appropriation could not go? Otherwise we might be asked in the course of years anywhere from \$15,000,000 to \$20,000,000 or whatever the administrative authorities figure it might be possible to expend. Does the gentleman not think it wise to fix a limitation?

Mr. DONDERO. May I answer the gentleman from Georgia in this way: The program under this bill is set up entirely by the 48 States. They must submit their budget estimates and their share of the costs to their legislative bodies. I believe that in itself places a reasonable limitation on the amount to be expended under this program.

Mr. TARVER. Does the gentleman think that it has been unwise heretofore to have a limitation in the law? We have always had one. Why should it be changed? Why should the procedure be changed where we have had a limitation of the authorization heretofore for 23 years, and Congress has always insisted upon having such a limitation?

Mr. DONDERO. I have tried to answer the gentleman by saying that the States under this bill have complete authority over the entire program, and it seems to me a fair limitation is placed on this subject because the States must pay half of the cost.

Mr. TARVER. Does the gentleman feel that it has been an unwise procedure over the past 23 years during which we have had a limitation with respect to the amount to be appropriated?

Mr. DONDERO. No; I do not think so, and I do not wish to be understood as saying so. But it does seem to me that in face of the conditions in which we are now situated and at war there is an effective limitation in the matching of funds and the restrictive powers carried in the pending bill.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. During the 23 years to which the gentleman from Georgia refers there has not been the uncertainty as to needs that there is in this time of war, when both in the military services and in industry men are being disabled who can be rehabilitated and returned to service.

Mr. DONDERO. Exactly.

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BLACKNEY. The gentleman is making a very fine statement. I am very much interested in the problem because of its educational scope, but I want to be sure that there is nothing in this bill that continues the apparent policy on the part of the Federal Government to encroach on the educational policies of the States. That is not in the program?

Mr. DONDERO. That is not in this bill. May I say to the gentleman that this bill does not in any way touch the subject of education except to rehabilitate those who have been incapacitated.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. I would like to say to the gentleman that for many years I have been consistently in favor of this kind of legislation and I am now, and I am strengthened in my support by a telegram which I received today from the director of education of Ohio, in which he says:

Congressman THOMAS A. JENKINS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Just advised that H. R. 2536 is on the calendar for Thursday. This vocational rehabilitation bill has many items of merit which would enable us to provide more benefits to Ohio citizens. We would appreciate the support of the Ohio delegation on this bill.

M. B. PERRIN, Director.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MURPHY. I would like to state that for years in Pennsylvania I was in favor of this type of program. And may I suggest it was the opinion of the committee, the reason why it did not wish to fix a limitation in the bill was because of the war and industrial uncertainty in the country, as well as its willingness to be protected under the wise, industrious, and able ability of the gentleman from Georgia, Judge TARVER.

Mr. DONDERO. Let me say that out of the last World War came 330,000 applications for rehabilitation within a 10-year period. One hundred and seventy-nine thousand of these were placed in training. That was based on an Army of 5,000,000 men. If the present program of the War Department is put into effect under which the armed forces are to be raised to 10,000,000 men, then we may expect, proportionately, double the number of cases for rehabilitation, or 600,000.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. First, I want to compliment the gentleman and the committee, particularly its chairman, upon the good job they have done in the consideration of this legislation.

Secondly, I want to state that I have been a schoolman all my life and associated with schoolmen all over the United States. I naturally receive mail from them today as a Member of Congress and every particle of mail from schoolmen that I have received recently concerning this proposed legislation has been favorable to the bill.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. KERR. I understand the purpose of this bill to be mainly to assist those who can be taken care of under a rehabilitation program attached to the school system in order to help those men who are untrained, particularly those who need to improve their talents, so that they will be enabled to meet the problems of life and be happier persons.

Mr. DONDERO. The bill provides for vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and limited physical restoration. It enables physically handicapped people to become self-sustaining.

Mr. KERR. It would be just a school feature for that purpose, then, and does not go further?

Mr. DONDERO. It does not.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. TALLE. Will the gentleman explain what was said about the proposed change in administrative costs?

Mr. DONDERO. The administrative costs under this bill, because the people who may be eligible for the services provided herein will be cases growing out of our war effort, is borne entirely by the Federal Government. That is a change from the present law, which provides a 50-50 matching with the States.

Mr. TALLE. And the gentleman does not believe that the proposed change will deprive the States of any power they now have?

Mr. DONDERO. I do not; because the States submit their bills for the cost of administration to the Federal Government, and the Government reimburses the States for the amount.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to correct a statement I made a few minutes ago in response to a question by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE] I believe it was. He asked me if there had been any limitation in the preceding acts on appropriations for this bill. I answered in the negative. I now find I was incorrect; there has been a limitation on the amount to be appropriated,

but in this particular act the only limitation which exists is the limitation to be placed by the Committee on Appropriations and by the amounts set up by the States to be matched.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. CARTER. I am a former member of the Committee on Education and am very much interested in this legislation and the work that has been carried on in the fields of vocational education and rehabilitation, but I do feel that there ought to be some limitation placed in section 9, the section that authorizes the appropriation.

Mr. BARDEN. I must be frank and make this admission to the gentleman: I think that the committee is composed of fairly intelligent men; I believe the program has been handled by fairly intelligent men. After a careful search of our minds and of the statistics we found nothing to guide us in fixing a limitation because we did not know how many hundreds of thousands were going to be injured in industry, we did not know how many soldiers were going to be crippled; there was simply no way to arrive at an estimate or to handle it except to reach out in thin air and just pluck a guess out of the air. The Committee on Appropriations is composed of men who sit down and comb these facts. They are not going to give any more money than can be absolutely justified.

Mr. CARTER. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I want to thank the gentleman for his kind remarks.

Mr. BARDEN. And may I say to the gentleman that apparently we have much more confidence in you than you have in yourselves.

Mr. CARTER. Notwithstanding the fact I am a member of the Committee on Appropriations and the unbounded confidence the Committee on Education has in the Committee on Appropriations, I still insist there should be a limitation. This is very poor authorization legislation, for you fix absolutely no amount. I would be willing to be generous and have an amount fixed that would probably be in excess of what might be used, but I do feel very strongly that there should be some limitation on this authorization so that we shall know at the end of the year not only how much money is being appropriated but how much money has been authorized.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. TARVER. In addition to what the gentleman from California has said—and I may say I heartily approve his statement—there has been in the law heretofore a limitation on the administrative expense, but if I understand this bill correctly it just leaves the sky the limit on the matter of administrative expense.

As one member of the subcommittee which handles this particular appropriation I want to say that you put a rather severe burden, a heavy burden, on the subcommittee, because these educational

authorities in their enthusiasm for their work, which is good work of course, will prepare programs which in all probability will far transcend anything which Congress had in mind when passing this legislation, and so far as administrative expense is concerned, the sky will be the limit with them if it is the limit with you; you ought to provide some limitation here.

Mr. BARDEN. The estimate of the present Administrator, as I said a minute ago, was that the first year it would not run much over \$12,000,000—it may go a little above that—but he did not see much chance of a peak beyond approximately \$25,000,000. He was conservative in his estimates and of course this must be matched by the States, with the exception mentioned by me previously. I might say to the gentleman that under the production training program right now there is being spent \$166,000,000 a year.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I think the bill also provides that the States shall submit an estimate to the Federal Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

The bill provides that the States shall submit an estimate of their program to the Federal Administrator each year, so that the Federal Government will know in advance substantially what the whole program will be for the coming year.

Mr. BARDEN. It is not a question of our resisting a limitation. We are frank enough to admit that we do not know where to put it, and I do not know of anybody else who knows how to fix such a limitation. Does the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. DONDERO. I think the gentleman has stated it accurately.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CARTER. Did the gentleman have any testimony before his committee as to the probable cost or estimate?

Mr. DONDERO. Yes, I stated that it is expected that the present program perhaps will be doubled. In other words, it will be \$6,000,000 on the part of the Federal Government and \$6,000,000 on the part of the States, which would be an average of about \$125,000 per State.

Mr. BARDEN. I believe the Director said it would likely go to \$22,000,000 or \$25,000,000 at the high peak.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, this is the first Congress in which I have served on the Committee on Education and it has been thus far a strenuous service but a very pleasant one. We all have an affectionate regard for our Chairman.

He has been very patient and very considerate in our discussions of this particular measure. I do not think that any committee has been more industrious in trying to solve a problem before it than has the Committee on Education in the consideration of this particular bill.

I call your attention to the fact that under existing circumstances this is peculiarly and necessarily and very largely a Federal bill, one for proper participation of the Federal Government because in its essence it is in the nature of a war measure. This bill, if enacted into law, practically supersedes the former legislation with reference to this subject.

We are having a great many men injured in industry in our war effort. We are having a great many of the soldiers fighting on the foreign fronts returned to us wounded and disabled. Here we have the prime purpose of enabling those people to get back into the war effort, and in these days when we are constantly reminded that there is a shortage of manpower, it becomes doubly our duty to rehabilitate vocationally these disabled people as rapidly as possible and get them into the respective tasks for which they are or can be fitted.

It is a little difficult, of course, to estimate the exact amount of money that is going to be required for this purpose because we cannot know absolutely how many will be injured in industry who can be rehabilitated and how many will be disabled in the conflict of the war. Heretofore this program has been economically administered with a small Federal force of 22 persons, and I doubt if that can be duplicated in any service of the Government taking into consideration the proportionate tasks of those services. We were very much impressed with the representations made to us concerning the administration of this act.

Mr. TALLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. TALLE. I should like to be fully satisfied that it is wise to make the change involving administrative costs which is proposed in this bill. Here is a force of 22 people which has done a good job under the present plan. Will an equally good job be done under the new plan? During the course of this debate I should like to have the administrative costs broken down so I may know what kind of services will be included under that head.

Mr. LANHAM. I am sure there will be members of the committee who will do that for the gentleman. At present I wish to call attention in the brief time at my disposal to one or two other features of this legislation.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman stated that this is largely a Federal bill. I think he should have said that it is a Federal bill from the standpoint of responsibility but not a Federal bill as it pertains to control.

Mr. LANHAM. Yes; I was just about to make that distinction.

Mr. Chairman, we who serve on this committee have been very much interested in seeing that the provisions of this law would provide for State operation and State control. The Federal angle comes in necessarily by reason of the fact, as I have stated, that this is essentially a war measure to provide manpower for our various lines of activity. The States under the proposal involved in this measure have a great deal more authority than they ever have had under laws of this character and we have been very meticulous in trying to get that kind of legislation. We feel we have done a good job.

One further matter I wish to mention is with reference to the physical rehabilitation of these people who are disabled. We are providing that this physical rehabilitation shall be given to those whose disabilities have become static. In other words, we are not going into the therapeutic treatment of all kinds of people for all kinds of trouble. If a disability has become static, if it is possible for the person to be reabsorbed into industry, it can be done quickly. For instance, suppose that a disabled person has lost some of the fingers of a hand or has lost a foot and the condition has become static. By the use of prosthetic appliances we can very quickly put that person back into industry and make him a useful and component part of our war effort.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL], a member of the committee.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry I have only 5 minutes. I wish I had 15 minutes, but we are very short of time. I shall make only one or two general observations. It would take me almost 5 minutes to read the passage in the bill here in answer to the question, but if you will turn to the bill it will save me the trouble. It is on page 8, beginning with subparagraph (1).

We worry about whether or not too much money will be spent under this bill. If we believe in the democratic processes of government, I think that will answer the question to begin with, because if Illinois sees fit to appropriate a certain amount of money for physical vocational training, the Government then matches that amount of money. In other words, the cost of this act will depend upon the number of people who are physically rehabilitated and upon the will of the people, expressed through their representatives, in the various States of the Nation.

When this bill came to us it had a good many ideas promulgated there that drifted away from the protection of the States. During some 30 days the 21 members of this committee attempted at all times to curb the power of the Government, not to extend bureaucracy but to retard its onward march in this country. I think I speak the sentiments of every man on the committee when I

say that we labored at all times with that in view, and with the bigger end in view of reconstructing physically people who need it and are not able to give it to themselves, taking them out of the position of being a burden to society and putting them into a position where they can have their own self-respect and not only contribute to maintaining themselves and their families but contribute to society generally. Thousands and thousands of them have been rehabilitated and are now working in the war plants. The records show that there is less absenteeism and that the production if anything is a little greater from these men who have been rehabilitated through the vocational educational systems under this contractual arrangement between the Government and the States.

We quibble about how much it will cost. It will not cost anything. This measure is legislation of economy. It places people in a position to get off the financial back of the National Government and sustain themselves. The more it costs, if it is well and economically run, as it has been, the more good it will do, and in the main, in the larger view, the more it will save the Nation.

I notice that the N. Y. A. has a bill in which it is asking some \$400,000,000 to set up some sort of an educational institution within the various States in competition with the public-school system to a certain extent. I assume there will be many people who will pass this large amount as a matter of course, and they will pass judgment favorably.

The National Housing Administration is asking in one bill alone for some \$400,000,000, in the face of the fact that Under Secretary of War General Patterson the other day testified that employment in the War Department has reached its peak and that it is going to be reduced by 100,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, in my judgment, this measure is legislation looking to the happiness and the development of the morale of the American people. This is not looking across the seas. We give billions to lend-lease. We spend billions to send the men in the Army to fight and to be maimed and crippled. What does it matter how much it costs when this is for our own people, to rehabilitate them and help out in our own economy, when it is for the happiness and contentment of our own people? This is an introspective view, something for our American people, and it is only a pittance, that we flit away with the wave of a hand in this Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK].

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of this measure and wish to compliment the committee on the careful consideration they have given this program. I do not know any-

thing about what has been accomplished in the other States of the Union but in my own State of Georgia, under the leadership of the State educational department, specifically under the direction of Mr. Paul Barrett, a great piece of work has been done in rehabilitating the physically handicapped persons and furnishing them the opportunity to work in the war program.

As I understand, this bill broadens the act a little bit and makes it possible also to rehabilitate those whose handicap is not entirely physical. It continues a program which has been successful, economical, and humane, and that has contributed in part to solving the shortage of manpower in industry during war time.

I do not believe it is generally known just how serious the problem of the handicapped is. The best information I have been able to get is that there are more than 20,000,000 people in the United States, or 1 out of every 7 of our population, who have some handicap, either major or minor or in between. There is a vast waste of productive capacity, a vast loss of earning power in this country due to our failure to make it possible for these people to earn a livelihood as they would be able to do if they had not become disabled.

A great many of our war industries today are making fine use of people who suffer from physical handicaps, because many of them have been trained outside of this program by industry itself and many others have been trained as a part of this program. Today they have found that these physically handicapped persons can do their part in the war effort. You will find thousands of them working in the war industries of the United States today because they have been given an opportunity to become qualified for that type of work.

I do not know whether or not we ought to put a limitation on this appropriation. We have millions of people working in our war plants today who never worked before. Millions of our war workers are working under stress and strain due to long hours and the desire to produce as much as possible. In all cases proper safety devices have not been provided. In addition, we are going to have many handicapped persons coming back from our armed services. Certainly it makes good sense, in my judgment, to provide sufficient funds to do this job and do it right. We ought not to be too economical about it, although of course we should not waste money.

As far as I am concerned, I am perfectly willing to abide by the judgment of this splendid committee. I know they have given long and careful consideration to this subject. We know, of course, that we have the check of the Committee on Appropriations as well as the check of the Members of the House and the Senate themselves before any money can be appropriated for this purpose.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes.

Mr. CARTER. What is the judgment of this committee in regard to the amount of money that should be authorized for this particular purpose?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I do not undertake to speak for the committee, but I have heard several here say that there is no way to estimate at the present time what the need will be, and I doubt the wisdom of making them come back to Congress and get an amendment increasing the authorization, when we have the splendid gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER] and 42 other fine men on the House Appropriations Committee, and if I can judge from what they have been doing recently, they are not wasting any money. I think we may as well leave that up to the gentleman and his colleagues on the Appropriations Committee, checked, as it will be by the Budget, by the Senate, and by ourselves as Members of the House, when the appropriation may be brought here. I am willing to leave it in that state. Let us do this job, let us give these people a chance to play their part in the activities of the United States, and in the war effort. We ought to pass this bill, in my judgment, without a dissenting vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GORE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 2536, and had come to no resolution thereon.

USE AND OPERATION OF WAR PLANTS IN PROSECUTION OF THE WAR—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I present for printing under the rule a conference report and statement upon the bill (S. 796) relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants in the interest of national defense.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION OF DISABLED PEOPLE

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H. R. 2536.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 2536, with Mr. GORE in the chair.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] a member of the committee.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I should like at the beginning to pay my tribute along with the other members of the committee to our chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina, for his patience with the committee, which was composed in large part of new members, and for whom this was the first bill on which we ever worked in Congress. The

bill was considered conscientiously and painstakingly, so that we could learn as much as possible, and we all appreciate the chairman's unfailing helpfulness and wisdom, along with that of the ranking minority member on the committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Dondero]. To work with them was as fine an introduction to the committee workings of this body as a new member could ever hope to receive.

I want to ask some of the questions that may be raised in regard to this bill, and try to give answers to them. First, how big a problem is this? As has been said, there are about 16,000,000 people in this country who are physically handicapped, but only about 3,000,000 need assistance in order to be placed in adequate remunerative occupations. Many of these need some help physically, but they are employed at least part time and managing to get along. However, there are more than 2,000,000 with major disabilities who are not financially able to get adequate training or occupation for themselves.

In addition to that 2,000,000, there are about 100,000 becoming disabled each year. Their number is greatly increased, so says the National Safety Council, because under the present war urgencies a great number of unskilled and partially trained people are entering highly skilled trades in war industries, and there are about 2,000,000 nonfatal accidents a year, and out of that number there are almost 100,000 whose disability is permanent, and require rehabilitation to get them back into useful occupation.

In addition, there are the registrants who are rejected for physical reasons by the draft boards, running as high as 45 percent. In many the disabilities were not known until they had physical examinations under the selective-service boards. Many need training for entering war factories.

Again there are those who are being discharged each month by the Army and the Navy. They passed the physical examination, but under the strenuous military training, some old injury like a football knee "pops up," and they are being discharged. Some of them are worse but their disability is not service connected and they cannot expect to get assistance under the bill for service-connected disabled veterans.

In addition there are a great many people in civilian defense, air wardens, merchant marine, civilian air patrol who are more subject than previously to injury, and also people being compelled to go to farms, where they never worked before and therefore have a high accident rate.

Then there is always the latent possibility of air raids, which would greatly increase the number of disabled. That is one of the reasons why the committee thought it was impossible to make even an approximate estimate of the probable cost of the program.

So the task really is gigantic. Under this program the States were training about 10,000 a year before the war. It has already expanded to 50,000, and it

probably will go to at least 100,000 a year.

They may be divided into three main groups. Some of them have an irremediable or unimprovable disability, and nothing that we can do or hope to do will improve them to a point where they can go back to their original occupation. They have to be trained around their disability. A man formerly worked as a policeman. Now both legs are off. He has to be trained at some job where he can sit down and use his hands, some technical skill that does not require the use of legs.

Then there is a second group whose physical disability is permanent, but can be corrected to a degree where they can return to their original jobs. This physical restoration is one of the things which this bill provides for and which was not in the previous legislation. All we could do before was to take a man as he is and try to train him around the disability for a new occupation. If a man had a cataract and there were no funds for having it removed, we had to train him in some skill suitable for the blind; whereas if perhaps \$150 could be provided and the cataract removed, he could go back again to the job he had before. Certainly that was a better expenditure of time and money than to have him spend weeks and months trying to be trained in a new skill.

There are people who have crippled legs and hands where, by performing an amputation, you could fit a man with an artificial limb and let him go back to the work he was in before, rather than start him entirely de novo to learn a new trade. Or a plastic or tendon transplant operation to strengthen or stabilize an old infantile paralysis extremity. Better to operate and restore a stiff joint to useful function than to make a man enter an occupation where he would not use the particular extremity.

There are individuals who have facial or other disfigurements that are a little repulsive to the public. They cannot get or hold a job unless they are given plastic operations or prosthetic devices which can correct most of the disfigurement. Often that alone enables them to resume their former occupations and is certainly rehabilitation of the best sort.

So where it is possible by some physical correction or restoration to fit a man to return to his basic work, that is good economy. It was not provided for in the present legislation. It is provided for in this bill.

Third, there are individuals who need both physical restoration of a static disability and also some vocational training. We have tried in this bill to deal with all three types.

The question may come up, Cannot this be done by the States without assistance from the Federal Government? There is one State, New Jersey, which has had a magnificent program of physical restoration due largely to the enthusiasm and generosity of one doctor. In fact, we learned a great deal from the experience of New Jersey, but they admit they have reached the bottom of the barrel. They

cannot finance this program any longer without some assistance, especially since the need has grown enormously because of the concentration of many war industries in that State, and the bringing in of workers from other places. It is too big for certain States to finance, because of the sudden increases in those areas.

Secondly, there are so many persons needing this new training who are primarily a Federal responsibility—those injured in war plants, which are the result of a war that the Congress declared. The merchant marine, the air wardens, the Civil Air Patrol—all of those individuals are working at a job which is a Federal job—war. We felt it was not right to saddle all these extra burdens onto the States without more help from the Federal Government than it had given in the past.

That brought up a third question: Could we get a workable relation, a satisfactory partnership between the States and the Federal Government that would meet three criteria—first, that would give Federal funds adequate to do the job to get these men trained, get them back to useful work, particularly during the war effort.

Second, could we have enough Federal control to avoid waste and inefficiency in the State programs; because we cannot turn over Federal money and have it squandered here and there.

Third, could we get proper Federal control and at the same time prevent centralization of power in Washington, prevent further breaking down of State's autonomy, prevent developing another army of workers who would be under Federal oath, responsible primarily to the Federal Government, whereby the Federal Government could try to coerce those States to its will, or use the workers as political agents for whatever administration was in power, or pour extra Government money into doubtful States to swing an election one way or the other, whether it was a Republican or a Democratic administration. We wanted to have safeguards over the use of the money and at the same time make sure we would not be building up another bureau that would be able to exert political or economic pressure in individual States. This has happened in so many other fields, as you are all aware, that it constitutes a danger which the committee could not rightly ignore.

The problem was to withhold funds from improperly administered agencies without starving out agencies that were properly administered. In this case an agency, which, as has been said, has an amazing record of efficiency and economy in administration. We worked harder on this in the committee than on anything else. I believe there have been written into the bill ironclad safeguards which will give the money to do the job, which will prevent any undue Federal interference with or control over the administration within a State under its own plan, and still will provide sufficient Federal control to avoid waste by the States of Federal money.

Now, lastly, what are the values of this program? First, from a humanitarian standpoint I am particularly interested in that as a physician. I know the most devastating thing that can happen to a human being is a sense of uselessness, to have society bring forth a man and then have no use for him. There is not a man worth his salt who does not protest inwardly and fret about that and begin to deteriorate internally unless he has unusual emotional insight. He loses his self-respect. He is a victim of pauperization and paternalism.

What can restore him so much as being able to make his own way again? Second, from a social standpoint, you cannot build a sound society with men who are primarily objects of charity.

The way to help men is not to give them things, but help them to help themselves, to acquire productive capacity or earning power, so they can be independent and self-sustaining, can hold their heads up in the community in which they live.

Discontent grows among men who are idle, men who are resentful over something that has happened to them, perhaps because of their patriotic and loyal service to their country, where the Nation has received the benefit and they are in effect cast aside except perhaps for a pittance as a pension or handout.

Third, as has been said by several others, from the standpoint of the war effort. When we are scouring the country to get men to work in factories and to work on farms, when we are disrupting millions of homes in order to put wives and mothers in many occupations to free men for heavier work, surely hundreds of thousands of those jobs being taken over by mothers could be done by men with physical handicaps if they had training to enable them to do that work, and thus relieve able-bodied men to switch to more difficult jobs, men who have more physical stamina and skill for very hard work. We cannot afford to have so many men idle because of disabilities which can be corrected or made employable.

But if one does not consider the above three reasons, there is the economic standpoint. I believe this a perfectly sound and necessary piece of legislation, viewed from the hard-headed standpoint of dollars and cents.

I do not regard this program primarily as a charity, I do not regard these men primarily as an obligation of the Federal Government. The primary consideration is that we have a government, which is spending money by the billions of dollars, and we want to get these men where many of them will not be on allowance of say, \$30 a month, drawing money from the Treasury; that is not the solution, we want to give them the ability to be putting money back into the Treasury, as has been said, convert them from tax eaters to taxpayers. It is wholly in the interests of the Nation, as well as of the individual to get him transformed from a receiver of assistance to a normally self-respecting, self-supporting citizen.

That applies no matter how, or when, or where he received his disability.

When we are spending a hundred billion dollars a year to make cripples, surely it is reasonable to spend six, ten, or even fifteen millions of dollars a year, on a 50-50 basis with the States in order to get these disabled persons back to productive work.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, H. R. 2536 relates to a program in which I have long been interested. The vocational rehabilitation of the physically handicapped citizens of the Nation is a program at once humanitarian in motives, practical in method, and effective in results. Established 22 years ago, this service for physically handicapped workers has proved its worth. I believe in it. And I am one who has followed its development and observed its accomplishments for well over a decade. Even before coming to the Congress I had become familiar in my own community with the advantages of a service to provide vocational guidance, training, and other types of preparation to physically handicapped persons of employable age.

Since coming to the Congress I have watched the expansion of the program on a national basis. In 1935 the Social Security Act included a section on vocational rehabilitation which increased and made permanent the annual authorization for the work. In 1939 the authorization for Federal grants to the States was increased again, this time from \$1,938,000 to \$3,500,000 a year. With the aid of this modest appropriation by the Federal Government and an equal amount by the States, the service is now provided on a State-wide basis in each of the 48 States as well as in Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia.

The State divisions of rehabilitation provide service currently to about 60,000 handicapped persons. In the fiscal year now coming to a close the States will rehabilitate approximately 50,000 handicapped persons. Three-fourths of these rehabilitated workers will be employed by war production or war-supporting industry. The remainder will be placed in essential civilian employments.

Today industry does not have to be begged or persuaded to employ the handicapped. Industry is well aware that they can meet current manpower shortages only through the utilization of groups who formerly have not formed an important part of our labor supply. Everybody recognizes the necessity for the wartime employment of women. Not so many, however, realize the importance of fully utilizing the services of the three or four million persons of employment age who have serious physical impairments. Industry is anxious to employ them. Especially in the great aircraft factories of the Nation the physically handicapped worker has been hired in tremendous numbers. Here they have

been found to be efficient, steady, and reliable. Their contribution has done much to enable the industry to meet the stupendous goals set by the Commander in Chief.

Recently I have seen letters from important producers of war materials saying that their handicapped employees are eminently satisfactory.

These letters are from industries in my own State, and I shall read excerpts. They are very illuminating. This is a letter from the General Electric Co., of Erie, Pa., and it states:

In general, our experience is that these people are very grateful for an opportunity to be employed, and as a result have an inherent desire to make good.

From another industry in the State of Pennsylvania comes a letter from the Philadelphia Blueprint Co., a very large company in Philadelphia, in which it is stated:

Our production is far superior in the jobs they are on to that of the more able-bodied. Absenteeism is at an extreme minimum. So far we have had very little turn-over. At the present writing we have had no accidents.

When interviewed by rehabilitation counselors and guided by them into jobs consistent with their abilities and suitable to their physical limitations, their productive output is on a par with that of the able-bodied. These handicapped persons appreciate a job, too. For that reason they stick to it, once they have it. Employers unanimously report that the rate of labor turn-over and the rate of absenteeism is far less among the handicapped than among the able-bodied.

But, mind you, the records already achieved did not just happen. Nor can the complete utilization of handicapped labor be achieved without constructive governmental action. State rehabilitation agencies have arranged the special types of training needed by handicapped persons; they have provided artificial appliances to restore lost function. Above all they have given practical and effective assistance in guiding the handicapped worker into a particular job in which his physical impairment does not detract from this productive efficiency.

H. R. 2536 extends and strengthens the provisions of the basic act under which the program has been operated. But there is no change in the fundamental principle or objective of the program. As I study the bill I find it has three basic objectives. First, it provides some additional financial assistance to the States; second, it corrects the greatest inadequacy of the present program, namely the lack of legal authority for providing physical restoration; and, third, it includes a temporary or emergency provision for additional expenditures during the 2-year period ending June 30, 1945. This last provision is, of course, intended to promote the fullest utilization of handicapped workers in war industries.

The Congress recently has passed legislation looking to the rehabilitation of persons disabled while serving in the

armed forces of the Nation. That problem will be provided for through the facilities of the Veterans' Administration. There is, however, another and closely related problem which the Veterans' Administration does not have and did not ask to have—jurisdiction. I refer to the thousands of young men discharged by the Army and Navy as a result of a so-called non-service-connected disability. Already thousands of such men have been discharged. In writing this bill full provision has been made for assisting these men to prepare for and to find useful wartime employment.

Finally, let me say that this bill makes no change in the administration of the program or in the Federal-State relationship that has existed since 1921. I believe this is very important, for in this program the Federal-State relationship has been especially cordial. Administrative responsibility for the actual operation of the programs has been left with the States, with the Federal Government exercising the leadership and general direction which the State officials have expected from it.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HULL].

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, until this afternoon I was unaware of any objections to the bill as reported by the committee. The adoption of suggested amendments may be wise in order to insure the early passage of this important legislation.

Wisconsin was one of the progressive States which pioneered in the movement for rehabilitation of disabled persons. It has developed a remarkably successful program. Our legislature long ago established a State board of vocational and adult education, of which Hon. George P. Hambrecht is director. Its rehabilitation division has been successfully administered by W. F. Faulkes, and continues its great work even though handicapped by lack of funds for the proper expansion of its program.

In the 30 years since the Wisconsin rehabilitation division has been engaged it has handled over 27,000 cases. Of that number, 12,987 succeeded in being registered for service, and 6,580 have been closed and returned to suitable employment, and 3,904 received the special training for particular lines in industry.

Certainly, now of all times, there is need for the legislation this bill provides.

Mr. Faulkes, our State supervisor of vocational rehabilitation, has kindly given this measure his consideration, and I shall ask consent to include in my remarks a statement which he has provided, in which he emphasizes the surpassing importance of the rehabilitation program and dwells upon the features of needed legislation. It is as follows:

REHABILITATION NEEDS FOR THE WAR EMERGENCY

(By W. F. Faulkes, State supervisor vocational rehabilitation)

It is a trite saying that "comparisons are odious." Too often the basis of opposition to a new or different policy or plan is the

likening to something within our immediate experience.

I recall an experience I had 30 years ago, when vocational education had its beginning in our State. It was a part-time program—part work and part education. The regular schoolman and "schoolmarm" had difficulty in reconciling actual work in a shop as part of an educational program. Today this reconciliation is generally recognized. The manual or industrial arts program then obtaining in high schools assumed that the ordinary manual arts instructor was qualified to teach any trade. He had to teach something of everything, but not all of anything. In other words, he was "jack of all trades" and master of none. When it was proposed, in the vocational schools, to have an instructor for each trade to be taught, the regular school people raised the cry of per capita costs. However, as the program progressed and commendable results were obtained, opposition gradually ceased.

Twenty-two years ago Congress enacted legislation providing for the vocational rehabilitation of physically handicapped persons. Prior to such legislation the physically handicapped person was largely barred from educational and vocational training activities, and to a larger extent such persons were denied the opportunity to work in accordance with their abilities. The fact that many physically handicapped persons were barred from attendance at public educational institutions was probably the reason for emphasizing education and vocational training as the major function of a rehabilitation program. At least, such was the interpretation placed upon such legislation, not only by the administrators of the Federal act, but by the administrators in many of the States. In Wisconsin the act happened to be drawn by lay persons and, as a consequence, it is one of the most comprehensive acts of its kind among the States of the Union. Notwithstanding the comprehensive features of the Wisconsin act, the emphasis has been placed upon vocational training and education in professional schools.

For a considerable number of years a few of the rehabilitation workers in the country have recognized that much more is involved in the rehabilitation of a physically handicapped person than that of education or vocational training alone. The Federal agency has been gradually brought to recognizing the other necessary features in an adequate rehabilitation program, such as prosthesis, physical restoration, and physical and occupational therapy. The physical correction of a physically handicapped person is not yet recognized by the Federal Government as a legitimate expenditure in the program that may be matched equally by State and Federal funds. The extension of a program of physical restoration involving hospitalization, corrective surgery, physical and occupational therapy will necessitate not only the introduction of specialists in such a program, but will necessitate a considerably increased staff for supervision. Then again, it has been difficult to bring about the recognition on the parts of State boards of education and State boards of vocational education that the rehabilitation of a physically handicapped person is largely one of an individual case-work character. The result has been that there is a greater need for actual case workers in a vocational rehabilitation program than there is in the regular vocational program that is being conducted by the States.

It can be vividly remembered by workers who are still in this field today that when the vocational education program was introduced in the States it was necessary, where an adequate program was promulgated, that a larger staff was necessary than in the regular educational program that preceded vocational edu-

cation. Likewise, in the rehabilitation program, which necessitated individual case work, a larger staff was predicated than was the case in vocational education. Again comparisons were made, with the result that the work of the vocational rehabilitation program has been impeded quite extensively over the country. We who have been working in the field of vocational rehabilitation have recognized that our first responsibility is to the physically handicapped person. Regardless of prerogatives that may prevail, it is essential that the Nation and the States render such service to the physically handicapped person, whether or not such person's disability has originated directly as a consequence of the war or in one of the many industries that are contributing to the war effort. All of these people must be served and reinstated physically, vocationally, and economically as close to their previous status as it is possible to accomplish.

A brief résumé of what has been accomplished since the initiation of the rehabilitation service may be opportune here, as it will indicate the needs for expansion.

The total number of cases reported to June 30, 1942, was 26,452. Of this number 12,987 had been registered for service and 6,580 have been closed as rehabilitated and returned to some kind of suitable employment. Of this number of rehabilitated cases, 3,904 had received some kind of training in preparation for the particular employment. However, also during this period approximately 4,000 were closed as nonsusceptible, persons so severely physically disabled that placement in regular employment was not possible. Many of these severely disabled could work under sheltered conditions such as the home or a shop especially provided for such purpose. In order to provide such opportunity to this deserving group, the 1940 legislature made available an appropriation of \$25,000 for such services. During the fiscal year 1940-41 the United States Office of Education agreed to match the State appropriation. The United States Office of Education has agreed to extend such aid to January 1, 1943, to the amount of \$11,000.

In order to carry out the policy of local participation, such homecraft service was worked out in cooperation with local vocational schools. During this initiatory period costs of instruction, travel, and supplies were paid from State and Federal funds. Although the Rehabilitation Division of the State Board of Vocational and Adult Education had accumulated considerable data indicating such need, the approach to the solution of the problem was largely experimental, and because of this it was considered best that during this finding period the costs should be taken care of from available State and Federal funds. The amount of money available, of course, limited the extent of the program. In order to obtain Federal funds for this homecraft program it was necessary to set up definite qualifications for the teachers for such program. Such qualifications were based upon training and experience. During the past fiscal year 24 centers operated under the State-Federal aid program, and 4 counties without such aid. Funds are not available for any expansion of the program at this time. Time will permit only a brief summary of the accomplishments. From July 1, 1941, to March 31, 1942, total sales amounted to \$14,173.67; material costs were \$4,077.88, yielding a profit of \$10,095.79 to the participants in the homecraft program. The continuation and extension of this service depends to a large extent upon future legislation, both Federal and State.

At this time there is pending in Congress a legislative proposal for materially expanding the rehabilitation program. This bill is

being sponsored by the National Rehabilitation Association in accordance with suggestions from the Federal Security Agency and the United States Bureau of the Budget. Congressman BARDEN, of North Carolina, introduced the bill in the House, H. R. 7484, and Senator LA FOLLETTE introduced a companion bill in the Senate, S. 2714.

This bill comprises three titles. Title I relates to the vocational rehabilitation of disabled individuals with war-connected disabilities. Title II relates to persons disabled in industry or otherwise. Title III relates to the vocational rehabilitation of blind persons.

Title I provides for the rehabilitation of the disabled persons who are members of the armed forces. Briefly, this title provides:

1. Sum sufficient to carry out the purposes of this title.

2. Administrative expenses of the State boards in carrying out the purposes of this title shall be paid by the Federal Government.

3. The rehabilitation training shall be delegated to the State boards in accordance with a plan set up for such purpose. The Federal Government shall pay all costs of such training.

4. All other services, such as determining eligibility, susceptibility, physical restoration, prosthesis, and placement, shall be the responsibility of the Federal agency unless such services are incorporated in the State plan.

Title II provides:

1. That rehabilitation training shall be the responsibility of the State board in accordance to the provisions included in the State plan.

2. The State boards will be reimbursed 100 percent for all administrative expenses.

3. The State board retains authority to appoint the personnel, which must, however, be in accordance to a merit system approved by the Federal agency.

4. For each dollar of Federal money expended for rehabilitation training there shall be expended by the State at least 50 cents for the same purpose.

There is one major discrepancy in this title. The first three lines of subsection 1 of section 202 read as follows: "In order to provide for the rehabilitation training of individuals certified to the States for such training by the Federal Security Administration," etc. It is proposed to amend this clause by striking out the words "certified to the States for", and inserting the words "entitled to", and striking out the words "by the Federal Security Administration."

According to conversations with the representatives of the Federal Security Agency and the Bureau of the Budget, more than three-fourths of the States are understaffed for the current program, and no State is adequately staffed to carry on the proposed expanded program.

Under the proposed program as included in the above legislative proposals, there will be added physical and occupational therapy, surgical and medical services, and considerable extension of prosthesis, and an expanded program of placement carried on on a functional basis.

It is my opinion that any State which sets forth an adequate and efficient program will be granted full authority to proceed. On several occasions, Wisconsin was complimented by the representatives of the Bureau of the Budget for continually expending more than the population allotment. I have contended for many years that physical rehabilitation should be included in the State program, but my pleas have always met with a deafened response.

Title III refers to the rehabilitation of blind persons, and proposes that such program be taken over entirely by the Federal agency. This title was added by the National Society for the Blind.

There is urgent need for an impetus and expansion of the rehabilitation program.

We must face the fact that the demand for manpower is rapidly increasing; in fact, the surplus is almost exhausted. Recent surveys have indicated that many millions of man-hours of labor can be supplied by disabled, who can be rehabilitated and prepared for many of the tasks in the defense industries and employments. Recently General Hershey stated that it has become mandatory for industry to make place for the one-armed and one-legged applicants in industry. During the past year the Rehabilitation Service placed in permanent suitable employment 731 physically handicapped persons. More than 50 percent were placed in the defense industries. During the current year the objective of accomplishment is a minimum of 1,000. The industries must have these workers in ever-increasing numbers. To win this war adequate production must be had, and production is not possible without adequate supply of manpower. That the disabled can be and have been refitted for employment and satisfactorily employed has been demonstrated a thousand times in our own State.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TROUTMAN].

Mr. TROUTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the pending legislation which should have the unanimous support of the entire House. The Committee on Education has very carefully studied the bill now before you; and after very extensive hearings under the able direction of our distinguished chairman, the bill was unanimously reported out for your consideration.

In these critical times when it becomes necessary to appropriate extraordinary sums for the purpose of waging war, all expenditures which are nonessential for the successful conduct of the war should either be eliminated or drastically curtailed. The present legislation, while causing an increase in expenditure, nevertheless makes a very important contribution to our entire war effort.

The present bill is an amendment to the act approved June 2, 1920, as amended, which provides for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment. The original act, together with the amendments thereto, has apparently been a workable piece of legislation. There has been complete harmony between the Federal director of vocational rehabilitation and the various State vocational rehabilitation boards. The pending measure makes no drastic change in the present arrangement except to clarify and enlarge the present vocational rehabilitation program.

The present bill does make two very important changes to which your attention is called. It provides for a matching of funds by the Federal Government and the States. For each dollar appropriated by the State, the Federal Government will appropriate a dollar. The Federal Government will also pay all administration expenses. The present act places the appropriation of funds on a ratio of population, which system has not been conducive to a maximum appropriation of funds for this important work by the various States. The pending legislation

clarifies the existing law by providing for physical restoration where the disabled individual is found to require financial assistance with respect thereto. Provision of physical restoration by the States is not forbidden. It has not been provided in the past because of limitation of funds and the feeling of the administrators that expenditures for such restoration were not authorized. The bill does not set up a State medical program but specifically limits the treatment to such treatment as might be necessary to correct or substantially modify a physical condition which is static and constitutes a substantial handicap to employment and is of such a nature that such correction or modification should eliminate or substantially reduce such handicap within a reasonable length of time. The act further provides for the furnishing of prosthetic devices as are essential to obtaining or retaining employment.

The main object of the legislation is to furnish services necessary to render a disabled person fit to engage in a remunerative occupation, within certain limitations. The purpose of the act is to bring back into gainful occupations those who are physically handicapped, the correction or modification of which handicap would permit them to become gainfully employed. Naturally some handicapped persons cannot be rehabilitated because of the severity of their disability or because of mental or emotional disturbances. It is estimated that within the male population 15 to 65 years of age there are some 7,000,000 persons whose physical condition was such that some vocational rehabilitation might be needed in their occupational guidance and selected placement. Somewhat more than a million others could be equally placed after minor physical repair or training around their handicaps or both. This group together with those suffering from defective vision, and women suffering from disabilities who would be available for industrial employment if rehabilitated, indicates the huge reservoir of manpower much of which could be utilized in a brief time and at a comparatively small cost.

There are very few problems facing our country more important than that of manpower. The needs of our armed forces must be met, and as a result severe shortages of workmen, both in industry and on the farms, are now prevalent. By tapping the huge reservoir of those persons whose physical handicaps can be corrected or modified so as to fit them for gainful employment, much of this acute shortage can be met. In my own State of Pennsylvania there is a potential load of 200,000 disabled persons in need of vocational rehabilitation. Each year approximately 80,000 new cases become permanently disabled through industrial or public accidents and disease. The very rapid expansion of industry, the increased speed of operations and the increased number of inexperienced workers, have caused the rate of disabilities from industrial accidents to increase at an alarming

rate. During the past 3 years there has been an increase of about 30 percent in the employment of workers in industry, but, on the other hand, there has been an increase of 70 percent in the incidence of disability among workers in industry. In addition, there are civilians whose disabilities are more directly connected with the war, particularly those in the protective services. There was a common agreement among all witnesses testifying before the committee as to the need for a greatly expanded vocational rehabilitation program. It was stated that at present more than 2,000,000 cases need the attention of the State rehabilitation services as speedily as it can be given them. Consideration must also be given to the fact that these disabled persons are doubly handicapped, not only by being injured, but also being unemployed without an opportunity for work.

Vocational rehabilitation will not only provide men for essential work but will also better the economic conditions of the handicapped person. Disabled persons are potential charges on the community and the State unless given an opportunity to make the most of what is left to them. They not only do not produce, but they consume a portion of the productive efforts of others. The State suffers economic loss because of the lack of productive power and because of the reduced purchasing power of this group. It is economically unsound to allow them to remain dependent. Unassisted, most handicapped workers are unable to prepare themselves for, secure, or hold employment in competition with normal workers.

Again referring to the State of Pennsylvania, approximately 13,000 disabled persons have been rehabilitated under the present program at an average cost of \$300 a person. To maintain a dependent at public expense costs from \$300 to \$500 a year. The potential income of a disabled person is \$1,200 per year and in many instances the average yearly wage of a rehabilitated person is in excess of his wage prior to his injury. The citizens of Pennsylvania are proud of the splendid work that has been done and is now being done by the Vocational Rehabilitation Bureau. Today more than 75 percent of the disabled persons who are prepared for and placed in employment by the Pennsylvania Rehabilitation Service are placed in work essential to war production, such as motor repairing, machine shop practice, bench workers, power machine operating, welding, tinsmiths, sheet metal, and drafting.

The bill now pending also takes into consideration vocational rehabilitation for the blind. There is probably no handicap suffered by man which is less understood than that of blindness. At one time to become blind was to become utterly useless not only to yourself but to the community. When we speak of the blind, we immediately picture a figure in dark glasses standing at a street corner with a tin cup. In the face of the present shortage of manpower for essential war industries, we are just begin-

ning to become aware of a reservoir of competent, dependable labor that has been waiting for an opportunity to become useful—the blind workers of this country. The list of jobs in industry in which blind workers are excelling is surprising and the range of possibilities is even wider. The list includes shell loading, inspection, rivet sorting, drill press operating, lathing, welding, and many other jobs too numerous to mention. His highly developed sense of touch, his greater powers of concentration, his care and precision in his movements, and his great store of physical energy has made the blind worker an extremely valuable addition to our labor army.

The question may be raised as to whether or not industry is willing to employ physically handicapped persons. As a matter of fact, industry is making repeated demands upon the various rehabilitation bureaus to furnish men and women for employment.

In a recent letter from the American Armament Corporation, of Allentown, Pa., to the Pennsylvania Bureau of Rehabilitation, the personnel director writes as follows in relation to a blind girl who had been employed by the company 3 months before the date of the letter:

In reply to your letter of February 26, I am pleased to advise you that the girl whom you placed with us on December 1, 1942, has proven to be a most satisfactory employee.

In addition to the hand-burring job on which you placed her, she has mastered several go-no-go gage operations in our inspection department. On all jobs her production has definitely been equal to that of any sighted employee doing the same type of work.

She has had one raise since starting and is at present receiving \$26 a week.

In another letter from a large manufacturing company located in the city of Erie, Pa., to the Pennsylvania Bureau of Rehabilitation, the personnel manager of that company writes as follows:

We have yet to find one cause for disappointment in placing physically handicapped people on jobs in our shop. Although in some instances their production is not equal to the top operators, it is within the average and what deficiencies they might have in production they make up in steadiness and dependability. We have not lost, through voluntary separation or discharge, any of our physically handicapped employees. In reference to your question of accident frequency we find them to be as safe workers as any in our plant.

Most of the large manufacturing companies of the country have seen the value of employing physically handicapped people who have received rehabilitation training. In my own State of Pennsylvania, the General Electric Co., the Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co., the Armstrong Cork Co., the American Car & Foundry Co., and scores of other companies have placed and are placing large numbers of physically handicapped workers into gainful employment. Under present conditions our industries and factories are taking all of the rehabilitated workers that they can secure.

The present bill will afford an opportunity to expand the present program so that many more thousands of disabled

persons may be brought back into gainful employment.

The real man is often masked behind his physical handicap. Rehabilitation not only brings to the foreground the capabilities and desires of the individual, but develops in him the feeling of confidence and satisfaction which enables the disabled person to excel in the accomplishments of life.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL].

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, at the outset of my remarks I think it only fair to offer my congratulations to the chairman and also to our distinguished minority ranking member on the Committee on Education, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO]. I think they are to be complimented at this time for bringing in legislation of this type. Perhaps my words may sound a little bald when I say that it may have been a good thing that the First World War was fought 25 years ago, before the present dilemma we find ourselves in. I make this statement because I feel it has given us a background for legislation such as is now being considered for the benefit of those disabled. It will take care of persons disabled in connection with industry in wartime, and it is also leading the way for even more complete vocational rehabilitation than we have ever known before. I was looking over a bit of the history of veterans' legislation not long ago and I noted that although peace was declared in November of 1918, scarcely a step was taken before 1920 to rehabilitate soldiers coming home from the battles of 2 years previous. I believe I am correct in stating that the first rehabilitation act was not passed until the middle of 1920. Such a predicament, it seems to me, must have created a lot of confusion and indefinite action on the part of the country. It therefore seems to me that we are moving in the right direction when we take steps to care for the men who will return from the present war. We should take this action before the advent of peace which we hope will come in a comparatively short time. As I have said, early veteran legislation was confused; it was indefinite, and it took a great deal of time, and possibly the benefit of knowledge of all the misfortunes of the First World War has resulted in this step being taken today, the consideration of this bill. I feel sure this is but the beginning of what is going to be done in behalf of the greatest body of American manhood ever to return victorious from a great war. I hope as we consider other measures of this type we will take into consideration all the needs, and anticipate their needs.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield. Mr. FERNANDEZ. As I understand this bill it is on a 50-50 basis of cost between the States and the Federal Government.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Is that the way it was handled in the previous law?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I am informed that it is.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I was wondering if the committee had taken into consideration the fact, for example, that New Mexico has more of her men in the armed forces injured and prisoners today than any other State except possibly Texas; that the wounded in battle are not distributed on an equal basis between the States. It seems to me that some consideration ought to be given to that fact so that States like New Mexico, which has had so many of her boys injured, could receive a little more consideration than is proposed in the pending bill as I read it in its present form. I hope the Congress will correct this situation within the next 2 years.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. I may say in answer to the gentleman from New Mexico that this bill contains a variable clause to run for 2 years in order to accommodate exactly the situation the gentleman presents to the House. I am sure the State of New Mexico will be taken care of.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I am glad the bill is before the House today and I hope it will be passed unanimously. When the boys come marching home, they will rejoice at their Congress' intelligent action, which will take adequate care of those who are maimed, disabled, wounded in the terrible conflict now raging.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, we have two amendments to offer to this measure.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. For a question.

Mr. FISH. If the gentleman is a student of this bill I should like to ask him whether it covers members of the merchant marine who are suffering the greatest casualties of any group in America today in the World War?

Mr. RANKIN. I am not sure about that, but I want to discuss another phase of it, and I have only 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we have an amendment we propose to offer to take the disabled veterans out of this bill. One of them is on page 5 after the word "duty", strike out all of line 5 and the balance down to and including all of line 9; and on page 6 beginning with line 3, to strike out all of line 3 and all of that paragraph down to and including all of line 9.

This measure reaches out and takes in service-connected disabled veterans, and that is unnecessary because they are already being taken care of by a bill reported by the World War Veterans' Committee passed and signed by the President. This amendment is also opposed by the veterans' organizations, and it is not looked on with favor by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. LANHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. I would like to explain to the gentleman that General Hines was before us on this matter. There are certain facilities to correct a disabled individual which exist in one place and the Veterans' Administration may not have a facility where the disabled person is.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand what the gentleman has in mind. This bill invades the jurisdiction of the World War Veterans' Committee and the Veterans' Administration, and is disturbing the set-up that we now have.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Also the legislation passed for the Veterans' Administration provides that the Veterans' Administration shall use all available facilities?

Mr. RANKIN. Why, certainly.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. We have that legislation already.

Mr. LANHAM. We want to give that permission also in this measure.

Mr. RANKIN. General Hines says that insofar as the Veterans' Administration is concerned, there is no necessity for the provisions of section 2 (10) and section 3 (a) 1 of H. R. 2536.

Those are the exact provisions I propose to strike out. Not only that, but I have letters from various veterans' organizations, and I have had a conference with the leaders of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the American Veterans of the World War today, and all three of them ask that those provisions go out of the bill because, if passed, it will begin disturbing our jurisdiction and stir up controversies over these veterans which they do not want, and if we do not win the fight here it will be carried over to the United States Senate.

I hope every Member of the House will vote with me to strike these provisions from the bill, and if that is done we will have no objection to its passage.

Here is a letter from one of the veterans' organizations:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
May 27, 1943.

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RANKIN: This is in reply to your note of the 25th requesting my reaction to provisions of H. R. 2536 which relate to disabled veterans, and I wish to say that in my opinion the references in this bill to disabled veterans are meaningless.

In the first place, Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, takes care of the rehabilitation of veterans having service-connected disabilities and the Veterans' Administration needs no additional authority insofar as that class of veterans is concerned.

In the second place, H. R. 2536 would cover veterans having non-service-connected disabilities in the same manner that it covers persons without military or naval service, without need of mention of "disabled veterans."

Section 2, clause 10, refers to "any disabled veterans certified pursuant to section 3 (a)

(I)," and section 3 (a) (I) relates only to disabled veterans covered by Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, since it refers to an "agreement between the Administrator [of the Federal Security Agency] and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs." Obviously, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs could only agree to something concerning that over which he has authority, and he has nothing whatever to do with the vocational rehabilitation of veterans having non-service-connected disabilities.

Since the Federal Government furnishes all of the funds for the rehabilitation of veterans having service-connected disabilities, there is no need for it to give to the States for a program with which the States have nothing to do.

And, since the States, in their rehabilitation of veterans having non-service-connected disabilities, would not differentiate between such veterans and persons without military or naval service, there is no need for the mention of "disabled veterans."

It is evident that the sponsors of H. R. 2536 have included reference to disabled veterans in this bill for sugar-coating purposes and to gain support of the bill by appearing to favor veterans.

If the sponsors of H. R. 2536 really want the bill to mean anything to veterans, they should eliminate the existing reference to disabled veterans and insert a proviso to the effect that disabled persons having an honorable discharge from the armed forces showing service of 90 days or more during a war, campaign, or expedition, shall be given preference. Otherwise, it is our recommendation that reference to disabled veterans be deleted from the bill.

Respectfully yours,
OMAR B. KETCHUM,
National Legislative Representative.

The section 2, clause 10, referred to by General Hines, has reference to any disabled veteran certified pursuant to section 3 (a) 1 and section 3 (a) 1 relates only to disabled veterans covered by Public Law 16, Sixty-eighth Congress. So you merely duplicate the work and stir up trouble for the Veterans' Administration when it comes to handling these men to whom we owe the highest obligation.

I hope my amendments will be agreed to when offered.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I regret very much that the gentleman from Mississippi saw fit to make certain statements in connection with this bill. The veterans' organizations that he speaks of have not been as cautious and as attentive about these matters as I would like to have seen them. There is not a single organization in the United States of America today rendering rehabilitation service to the veteran except this rehabilitation service here, and the war has been going on for 1½ years.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I do not yield at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I do not run around asking the veterans' organizations what I can do. I have been a member of veterans' organizations ever since they were created. I have served on virtually every committee in the American Legion and some of the other organizations, and I think I know a little about the duties,

the responsibilities, and the wishes of the American Legion and some of the other organizations.

I have here a letter from the Veterans of Foreign Wars saying that they approve of the bill. I quote from the letter as follows:

This bill is within the scope of the current program of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. We believe it to be a most important one, and urge its favorable consideration.

Mr. GEARHART. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I cannot yield at this time.

Mr. GEARHART. I have a letter to the contrary.

Mr. BARDEN. Who are you going to believe? Here is the letter.

Mr. GEARHART. All right. Read this one. Let us put both of them in the Record.

Mr. BARDEN. I do not know how we are going to legislate for veterans' organizations if they are going to write the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] one kind of a letter and write me another kind of letter.

Mr. GEARHART. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. Will the gentleman permit me to get to a certain point?

Mr. GEARHART. Have you any doubt about the stand of the American Legion?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declined to yield.

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman. What was the question?

Mr. GEARHART. Have you any doubt as to the stand the American Legion has taken in reference to this bill?

Mr. BARDEN. I do not know anything about what the American Legion's stand is in connection with this. I know they appeared before the committee and they said they wanted section 1 of the bill taken out and if that was taken out they were in favor of the rehabilitation bill.

Mr. GEARHART. Let me ask one more question. Did you not call the American Legion less than a half-hour ago and they told you they were against this bill?

Mr. BARDEN. Now, I called the American Legion headquarters and I called for Mr. Sullivan. Mr. Sullivan was not there. I called for Mr. Stubblefield and he was not there. The lady said, "I am interested to know what you are calling about." I stated that I was calling about this bill to see if they had changed their minds. She said, "If the veterans are in they want them removed." Does that answer the gentleman's question?

Mr. GEARHART. That is a very precise answer.

Mr. BARDEN. Where were they? The last time I saw them the bill was O. K. Let me tell you all there is in this.

When we were considering this bill before the committee, the committee struck out section 1 known as the veterans' provision. When Public, 16 was passed, this is what they put in it, and they put

it in at the request and after the statement of General Hines, who said that he wanted and expected to use the facilities of this organization because they had done a grand job with it. This is what was written into Public, 16:

And may utilize and extend existing Veterans' Administration facilities and utilize those of any other governmental agency as well as those maintained by joint Federal and State contribution.

That is a specific and direct reference to this act.

Now let me come to what we put in this bill.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I have a message from Mr. Rice, of the Disabled American Veterans, and he is very anxious to have us support the Rankin amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. BARDEN. I yield myself 5 additional minutes, Mr. Chairman.

This is what we are dealing with. These folks sit downtown and phone up here. I feel that I have some responsibility for these veterans. The men in Africa and in the Pacific do not belong to any veterans' organization. I feel that I have some responsibility for this rehabilitation program. Public, 16 takes care of only 10 percent of those in the armed services who will need rehabilitation. It takes care only of those who are service-connected after the Veterans' Administration declares them to be service-connected, which may be 1 month, 2 months, 5 years, or even 20 years as it is operating now. Somebody must look after the rest of them.

This is what you are attempting to do. We begin on page 2 of this bill, section 2 (a):

To be approvable under this act, a State plan for vocational rehabilitation shall—

Then you come over here to subparagraph (10):

Shall also be available to any disabled veteran certified pursuant to section 3 (a) (1).

Now let us take section 3 (a) (1). This refers to the payments to the States:

From the sums made available pursuant to section 2, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to each State which has an approved plan for vocational rehabilitation, for each quarter or other shorter payment period prescribed by the Administrator, the sum of amounts he determines to be—

(1) Necessary expenditures in such period (exclusive of administrative expense) for vocational rehabilitation services provided disabled veterans entitled thereto under laws administered by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and certified therefor pursuant to agreement between the Administrator and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

Is not that what they intended in this law, Public, 16, when they wrote in this language:

And may utilize . . . other governmental agency as well as those maintained by joint Federal and State contribution.

This is what we are trying to do here. We are trying to make the best possible set-up for General Hines to utilize the only agency in the United States that is equipped to do it. There is no restriction, there is nothing else in there. This will enable the rehabilitation service to carry on a better and a more workable program.

This is the statement of General Hines:

Insofar, therefore, as concerns the Veterans' Administration, the provisions in question in the present bill are considered unnecessary, but no objection thereto is expressed in view of the complete authority in existing law.

If the rehabilitation services officials say this makes a better and more workable bill for them, when they have been doing the work for 23 years, and General Hines says there is no objection and that it will in no way interfere with him, then why strike it out?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman referred a white ago to the letters. I read from General Hines' letter, where he said that these provisions of the bill are not necessary.

Mr. BARDEN. Why does not the gentleman read the rest of it and say, "But no objection thereto is expressed in view of the complete authority in existing law"? Why does not the gentleman read the rest of it?

Mr. RANKIN. Because it is not in the letter to which I referred, written on June 3. The other letter I read was from the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has again expired.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

I am just as much interested in the veterans of this country as any member of the Veterans of Foreign Wars or the American Legion in the United States of America, and I know about as much about this subject. I have been in the work long enough to know that. God knows I would not put a word in here that would impede or hinder any serviceman from getting the best possible treatment. I was the one who started this. My bill was under consideration before the gentleman from Mississippi or the Legion folks downtown ever thought about it, and the war had been going on a whole year.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand there was an attempt on the part of some people to get jurisdiction of the veterans, and they will not get it.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. The gentleman from Mississippi knows better than to make a statement like that. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. If this is stricken out, what provision will there be for the rehabilitation of disabled veterans whose disabilities have not been service-connected?

Mr. BARDEN. There will be some question about it.

Mr. LANHAM. And the fact that we struck it out would make a question.

Mr. BARDEN. Who is going to take care of these veterans who come in here and say, "I am a service-connected veteran" and they are told that the Veterans' Administration has not so declared them such, and then they go ahead and rehabilitate that man before the Veterans' Administration ever recognizes him as a service-connected case?

Mr. GEARHART. If he is not officially declared to be a disabled veteran, he is entitled to rehabilitation under the terms of the act that the gentleman is asking us to pass, is he not?

Mr. BARDEN. Certainly.

Mr. GEARHART. Then if he is, he is entitled to rehabilitation under the act that we passed in the last Congress.

Mr. BARDEN. Certainly, but the man will not say that he is not a service-connected veteran. He is going to contend that he belongs in that list.

Mr. GEARHART. It is not for him to say, it is the law.

Mr. BARDEN. The gentleman knows this, and I will be fair with the gentleman. He knows, and the gentleman has heard me on the subject of the Legion and the veterans enough to know that I would not put a word in here that would invade General Hines' authority, or injure a veteran. If these Legion boys downtown are going to try to look after the boys in the present war they should try to find time to come by and offer their assistance to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes. My record in this House during the last 10 years will speak louder than anything that I can say today. I have always supported legislation which, in my judgment, was reasonable and would bring just benefits to the veterans of this country. I would not today oppose the Veterans' Administration. When they came before our committee and requested that title I of the proposed bill be stricken out it was stricken out. This is all new that an amendment should be brought on the floor of this House today to strike out the language in the bill as suggested by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]. It seems to me it would be a mistake, because only those veterans that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs desires to include under the Federal Security Agency will be included. No request was made by the veterans' organizations nor the Veterans' Administration to delete the language in question.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The Government and the country would not allow for one minute that the veteran should not come under this. The only thing that we are trying to do is to keep out 10 percent and have them under the Veterans' Administration, where they have always been cared for. Under that resolution, you have the right now to Mr. McNutt's assistance, and surely this bill would take care of 90 percent, and

they would be classed as people, and not as veterans. When their service connection is established, where a man says I am, and the Administrator says he is not, then that kind of a case should be taken care of under the law.

Mr. RANKIN. Every veterans' organization is opposed to this bill.

Mr. DONDERO. Then why did they not come to the committee and say so?

Mr. RANKIN. They think that you are reaching out and mixing the veterans with all of these other social securities, and the veterans will be made a common carrier to break down the appropriation for all of this vast expenditure that will come in the future. They want to be separate and distinct, to be treated as they have been treated in the past, and every veterans' organization is for this amendment which I propose to offer.

Mr. DONDERO. Why did they not say so to our committee?

Mr. RANKIN. I conferred with them today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON].

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I also want to add my humble endorsement to the fine work of this committee.

The reason I am taking these 3 minutes is that I had a little experience in rehabilitation work following the last war. When I came out of the war and tried to rebuild my law practice I worked for about 2 years on a part-time job for the Veterans' Board for Vocational Training. That gave me an insight into the value of this kind of work.

I want to say I think this bill presents every correct principle for handling this problem. First, it teaches a man to stand on his own feet, no matter what his disabilities may be. Second, it utilizes existing facilities. In my State of California we have had 25 years of tremendously successful work in rehabilitating disabled men of all kinds. The work they do is utterly surprising. Third, it decentralizes the administration of this affair.

The results to be attained by this legislation, as I see them, are twofold. One is monetary. In other words, you take men who are drones in society because their disabilities make it impossible for them to work and build them into citizens who can take care of their families, pay their taxes, and carry their own burdens.

But it has another aspect that is far more important than the monetary gain, and that is the social aspect. During my limited experience I got jobs for and supervised the work of about 150 men. When you observe those men, many who are very despondent, who are utterly helpless, who feel the world is entirely hopeless, and that they cannot make their way in life and you get a job for them, and they build themselves up and they learn to surmount their handicaps, you see the brightness come back to their

eyes, you see them again become excellent, self-reliant, independent citizens. Their whole attitude and outlook changes. I do not know of any program that can appeal more to human beings than that kind of a program. In my short experience those men had every disability—lost limbs, lost eyes, stomach ulcers, one was partially insane. They were built back into creative citizens. As the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] said, there is nothing we can think of that is more constructive, that has a more far-reaching influence in the future than this particular kind of work. There is no better Americanism program than this vocational program.

Therefore I want to add my testimony in support of and urge my colleagues to vote for this bill. I hope we will not bog down into a fight over some of the provisions of this bill between the various departments of Government, because it is a fine, constructive piece of legislation. If there is overlapping jurisdiction, let us take out those provisions which some think curtail the authority of the Veterans' Administration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, in considering this very important legislation, let us keep ourselves on the plane that the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] has lifted us to. He spoke of his own experience and the great need of men who are injured beyond bearing. I would like to plead with this Committee to consider long before they permit a lowering of the ideals for which this bill stands. If we allow this legislation to slide down the hill into a place where the need of the soldiers will be made the gateway for political abuses it will be the most tragic rather than the most beautiful thing this Congress has ever done. I would like to beg you very earnestly to consider the few parts of this bill that have been suggested as best to be taken out.

There is so much going on today similar to that to which the gentleman from New York referred. Out at Walter Reed Hospital today a young man, an officer terribly burned many years ago, spends 2 days a week going to those burned beyond recognition and saying to them, as the blind man did in England, "Fellows, I, too, have been burned out of all recognition; early plastic surgery was done on me and I am ever grateful. Now they are doing these things better. You'll have to get used to it, of course. I did, and you can. I'm telling you they will give you a face again with which you can go out into the community and hold your heads high and live a full and constructive life."

That is happening twice a week right this moment.

Mr. Chairman, so much of this is needed and will be. Let us rejoice that there are such men as these.

If we are seeking to do this thing well, let us search not only our hearts but the implications and the double meaning of

words in the language of this bill, remembering that members of the committee have told us they would not have been put in had they known the feeling of the veterans' organizations.

I think that we will do ourselves an injustice as an institution, as the finest legislative group there is, if we permit ourselves to do less than our best. I would like to leave with you the hope that you will delete from this bill those few little passages which have in them very real danger to the aim and purpose for which this legislation has really been framed by a loyal, hard-working, and splendid committee.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART].

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, despite the fact that there has been a little acrimonious discussion with respect to one part of one section of this bill, acrimony which I am largely responsible for, I am very wholeheartedly for the legislation we have under consideration. I do want to congratulate the Committee on Education for producing it.

But notwithstanding my approval of the bill as a whole, I am very much opposed to part of section 3 because I know it is going to be used to deprive the Veterans' Administration of the right to rehabilitate our disabled veterans who are yet to be returned to us, some of them so broken and crippled as to be just tragic human caricatures of the fine boys who marched so bravely away. I want the great responsibility of caring for the disabled veterans to be left exclusively and completely in the trained, experienced, and sympathetic hands of those in whom the veterans themselves repose confidence. Adopt the Rankin amendments, and the fears so many of us have expressed will be forever laid away.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY].

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, this measure is one of great importance. One wonders why such legislation was not proposed long ago. At this time of war with a manpower shortage looming large this legislation becomes necessary. Ten years of social work has brought to me the conviction that some program should be adopted to aid the disabled—to rehabilitate them and thereby place them back to normal lives and lives which offer a productive contribution to the Nation. The splendid feature provides for veterans' border-line cases—those which are not of service-connected disability. I have seen many of these cases—cases which were worthy of attention but under existing law no help could be provided.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I have never seen a piece of legislation that was so carefully drawn. The two provisions that have been discussed here are granting provisions; they are not restrictions. I shall hate very much to see this House interfere or upset a bill that has been so carefully worked out as this bill has been. They will save General Hines and

possibly the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] much grief. But I say in all frankness and fairness the language in the bill helps Public 16 more than it helps this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment," approved June 2, 1920, as amended (U. S. C., title 29, ch. 4), is amended to read as follows:

"AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS

"SECTION 1. Moneys made available for the purpose pursuant to this act shall be used for making payments to States (and Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico, herein referred to as 'States') which have submitted, and had approved by the Federal Security Administrator (herein referred to as the 'Administrator'), State plans for vocational rehabilitation of disabled individuals.

"STATE PLANS

"SEC. 2. (a) To be approvable under this act, a State plan for vocational rehabilitation shall—

"(1) designate the State board of vocational education (herein referred to as the 'State board') as the sole agency for the administration, supervision, and control of the State plan; except that where under the State's law, the State blind commission, or other agency which provides assistance or services to the adult blind is authorized to provide them vocational rehabilitation, the plan shall provide for administration by such State blind commission or other State agency of the part of the plan under which vocational rehabilitation is provided the blind; *Provided*, That in any State which by law has established a rehabilitation commission prior to the date of enactment of this act, with authority to provide rehabilitation services to disabled persons, the State board may delegate to such commission all or any part of the operation of the State plan, under a written agreement of cooperation approved by the Administrator;

"(2) provide that the State treasurer (or, if there be no State treasurer, the officer exercising similar functions for the State) be appointed as custodian of funds received under this act from the Federal Government and receive and provide for the proper custody of such funds;

"(3) show the plan, policies, and methods to be followed in carrying out the work under the State plan and in its administration and supervision;

"(4) provide that vocational rehabilitation under the plan shall be made available only to such classes of individuals as shall be approved by the Administrator;

"(5) contain such provisions as to the qualification of personnel for appointment in administering the plan as are necessary to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards; the duty of the Administrator in approving a plan shall be solely the determination of whether the plan contains such provisions, but the Administrator shall exercise no authority with respect to the selection, method of selection, tenure of office, or compensation of any individual employed in accordance with such provisions;

"(6) provide such methods of administration, other than establishment and maintenance of personnel standards, as are found by the Administrator to be necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the plan;

"(7) provide that the State board will make such reports, in such form and con-

taining such information, as the Administrator may from time to time require, and comply with such provisions as he may from time to time find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports;

"(8) provide that no portion of any money paid to the State under this act shall be applied, directly or indirectly, to the purchase, preservation, erection, or repair of any building or buildings, or for the purchase or rental of any land for administrative purposes;

"(9) provide for compliance with such rules, regulations, and standards with respect to expenditures upon which Federal grants are made available under section 3 (a) as the Administrator may establish, including (A) provisions designed to secure good conduct, regular attendance, and cooperation of trainees and reduction of allowance in the case of on-the-job training; (B) maximum fees which may be paid for training and maximum duration of training; (C) maximum schedules of fees for surgery, therapeutic treatment, hospitalization, and medical examination, and for prosthetic devices; and (D) maximum rates of compensation of personnel; and

"(10) provide that vocational rehabilitation provided under the State plan shall be available, under such rules and regulations as the Administrator shall prescribe, to any civil employee of the United States disabled while in the performance of his duty, and shall also be available to any disabled veteran certified pursuant to section 3 (a) (1).

"(b) The Administrator shall approve any plan which he believes to be feasible and which fulfills the conditions specified in subsection (a) of this section, except that he shall not approve any plan which he finds contains such restrictions with respect to the expenditure of funds under such plan as would (1) substantially increase the costs of vocational rehabilitation in the State, or (2) seriously impair the effectiveness of the State plan in carrying out the purposes of this act.

"PAYMENTS TO STATES

"SEC. 3. (a) From the sums made available pursuant to section 2, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to each State which has an approved plan for vocational rehabilitation, for each quarter or other shorter payment period prescribed by the Administrator, the sum of amounts he determines to be—

"(1) necessary expenditures in such period (exclusive of administrative expense) for vocational rehabilitation services provided disabled veterans entitled thereto under laws administered by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and certified thereof pursuant to agreement between the Administrator and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; and

"(2) one-half of necessary expenditures under such plan in such period (exclusive of administrative expense) for rehabilitation training of other disabled individuals; and

"(3) one-half of necessary expenditures under such plan in such period (exclusive of administrative expense) for rehabilitation services specified in subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), (D), and (E); to disabled individuals (other than those with respect to whom payments are made under par. (1) found to require financial assistance with respect thereto, after full consideration of the eligibility of such individual for any similar benefit by way of pension, compensation, or insurance, such rehabilitation services being—

"(A) corrective surgery or therapeutic treatment necessary to correct or substantially modify a physical condition which is static and constitutes a substantial handicap to employment, but is of such a nature that such correction or modification should eliminate or substantially reduce such handicap within a reasonable length of time;

"(B) necessary hospitalization, in no case to exceed 90 days, in connection with surgery or treatment specified in subparagraph (A);

"(C) medical examination where necessary to determine eligibility for vocational rehabilitation, the nature of rehabilitation services required, or the occupational limitations of the person examined;

"(D) such prosthetic devices as are essential to obtaining or retaining employment;

"(E) maintenance not exceeding the estimated cost of subsistence during training, including the cost of any necessary books and other training material;

"(4) expenditures in such period necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the plan, including necessary administrative costs in connection with providing the foregoing services to, and guidance and placement of, disabled individuals.

"(b) In the case of any State found by the Administrator to have substantially exhausted its funds available for necessary expenditures specified in subsection (a), he may increase amounts payable to such State under such subsection during periods prior to July 1, 1945, under such conditions as shall be prescribed in regulations promulgated by him.

"(c) The method of computing and paying amounts pursuant to subsections (a) and (b) shall be as follows:

"(1) The Administrator shall from time to time estimate the amount to be paid to each State under the provisions of this act, such estimate to be based on (A) a report filed by the State containing its estimate of the total sum to be expended for vocational rehabilitation during the period for which such estimate is made, and stating the amount appropriated or made available by the State and its political subdivisions for such expenditures in such period, (B) a report filed by the State containing its estimate for such period of the administrative expenses to be incurred by the State board in carrying out its functions under such State plan, (C) records showing the number of individuals in the State needing and eligible under the State plan for vocational rehabilitation, and (D) such other investigation as the Administrator may find necessary.

"(2) The Administrator shall then certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the amount so estimated by the Administrator for any period, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum by which he finds that his estimate for any prior period was greater or less than the amount which should have been paid to the State for such prior period, except that such increases or reductions shall not be made to the extent that such sums have been applied to make the amount certified for any prior period greater or less than the amount estimated by the Administrator for such prior period.

"(3) The Secretary of the Treasury shall, upon receiving such certification, pay, through the Division of Disbursement of the Treasury Department and prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office to the State, at the time or times fixed by the Administrator, the amounts so certified. The money so received by the State shall be paid out in accordance with the provisions of the State plan.

"OPERATION OF STATE PLANS

"Sec. 4. Whenever the Administrator, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State board, finds that in the administration of the plan there is—

"(1) A failure to comply substantially with any provision required by section 2 (a) to be included in the plan, or any restriction on expenditures imposed in conflict with section 2 (b); or

"(2) A failure to afford reasonable cooperation with other Federal and State agencies providing vocational rehabilitation or similar services,

the Administrator shall notify such State board that further payments will not be made to the State under this act until he is satisfied that there will no longer be any such failure. Until he is so satisfied the Administrator shall make no further certification to the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to such State under this act.

"SERVICES FOR STATE BOARDS

"Sec. 5. To facilitate the operation of State plans under this act, the Administrator is hereby authorized to enter into agreements with State boards needing access to special facilities and services and to furnish to such boards, on a cost basis, services and facilities; and is hereby authorized to establish such needed facilities. Costs of furnishing such facilities and services for any State shall be paid from funds appropriated pursuant to this act, but shall be deemed expenditures under the State plan, and reimbursement with respect to such cost shall be made by deducting an amount equal to such cost from payments made to such State under this act.

"DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

"Sec. 6. Out of funds made available for the purpose, the Administrator is authorized to provide vocational rehabilitation services to disabled persons actually residing in the District of Columbia and to formulate and carry out a plan of cooperation with the United States Employees' Compensation Commission with respect to the vocational rehabilitation of any such disabled residents as are civil employees of the United States disabled while in the performance of duty.

"ADMINISTRATION

"Sec. 7. (a) In carrying out his duties under this act, the Administrator is authorized—

"(1) to utilize and enlarge facilities of appropriate units of the Federal Security Agency, and to enter into agreements and cooperative working arrangements with public agencies and private persons, agencies, and institutions, within the United States, its Territories, and possessions, for services and use of facilities of such persons, agencies, and institutions and to compensate them and such units for such services and use;

"(2) to make studies, investigations, and reports with respect to abilities, aptitudes, and capacities of handicapped individuals, development of their potentialities, and their utilization in gainful and suitable employment, or to contract with other agencies, including foreign agencies, for the making of such studies, investigations, or reports by such other agencies;

"(3) to conduct appropriate courses of instruction for any personnel who participate or will participate in carrying out the purposes of this act, and to detail such personnel to attend such courses and appropriate courses of not more than 6 weeks' duration conducted by other public agencies and private agencies and organizations, which detail shall be part of the official duties of such employees;

"(4) to provide personnel so detailed with necessary books and other material and pay their tuition, or reimburse them for expenditures therefor; and, in any case where such detail is away from an employee's official station he may, for purposes of subsistence and traveling expenses, be deemed on travel status.

"(b) Payment for use of facilities, and services obtained pursuant to this act by the Administrator from units of the Federal Security Agency or other Federal agencies, shall be by check either in advance or as reimbursement, for the actual or estimated cost of such facilities and services, and amounts so paid shall be credited, as determined by such Administrator, either to special working funds as provided in existing law or to the appropriation or appropriations against which charges are to be made or have been

made in providing the facilities or services, and payment for services and facilities of other agencies shall be made by check to the payee or payees specified by such agencies.

"(c) The Administrator is hereby authorized to promulgate such regulations, and to delegate to any officer or employee of the United States such of his powers and duties, except the promulgation of regulations, as he finds necessary or expedient in carrying out the purposes of this act.

"REPORTS

"Sec. 8. Annual reports shall be made to the Congress by the Administrator as to the administration of this act.

"APPROPRIATION

"Sec. 9. There are hereby authorized to be included for each fiscal year in the appropriations for the Federal Security Agency such sums as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, including an equitable share from District of Columbia funds of the sums made available for carrying out the purposes of section 6.

"DEFINITION

"Sec. 10. As used in this act, the terms 'vocational rehabilitation' and 'vocational rehabilitation services' mean any services necessary to render a disabled person fit to engage in a remunerative occupation. Such terms shall not, however, be considered to require any State to provide all such services which may be necessary, but a State plan may be limited to training, or to training and any one or more of the other vocational rehabilitation services.

"SHORT TITLE

"Sec. 11. This act may be cited as the 'Vocational Rehabilitation Act.'

SEC. 2. Effective July 1, 1943, the act entitled "An act to provide for the vocational rehabilitation of disabled residents of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved February 23, 1929, as amended, is hereby repealed.

SEC. 3. (a) The act of June 2, 1920, as in effect prior to the enactment of this act, and plans and regulations approved and promulgated thereunder prior to the enactment of this act may, notwithstanding the amendment made by section 1 of this act, be considered to remain in effect with respect to the period ending 90 days after the date of the enactment of this act; and the plan formulated with the United States Employees' Compensation Commission pursuant to the act of February 23, 1929, as in effect prior to the enactment of this act, and regulations promulgated under such act of February 23, 1929, prior to the enactment of this act, shall remain in effect except to the extent they may be hereafter modified or superseded.

(b) If any State cannot fully comply with the conditions of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended by this act, on the date of the enactment of this act such State may secure the benefits of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act as so amended, until 60 days after the legislature of such State first meets in due course after such date of enactment or until the earliest effective date after such 60 days which could be given in such State to legislation passed within such 60 days to secure the benefits of this act, whichever is the later, if it complies therewith to the extent possible.

SEC. 4. This act may be cited as the "Vocational Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1943."

Mr. BARDEN (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read, to be printed in the Record at this point, and to be subject to amendment at any place.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the section to which I have called attention, and which I hope will be stricken out of the bill by the adoption of the Rankin amendment, is totally unnecessary to the complete administration of the measure we have under consideration, if it becomes a law. It is entirely unnecessary to the legislation, put in, I am quite certain, for one purpose and one purpose only: To give to the Federal Security Administrator the power to take over, through the control of the purse strings, the control of the responsibility of rehabilitation of disabled veterans, which we conferred upon the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs in the act of March 24, 1943. If that were the purpose, the objectionable section was ingeniously conceived. That it would lend itself to such an unhappy manipulation, cannot be denied.

How could that be accomplished? Very, very easily. The section which the Rankin amendment would strike out would, in effect, require the appropriation for the care of disabled veterans and their rehabilitation to be made, not to the Veterans' Administration, but to Administrator McNutt's organization. Then, in order for General Hines to get any part of that money for the purpose of compensating State agencies that he may avail himself of, it would be necessary for him to enter into some sort of an agreement with Administrator McNutt. In the making of that agreement the terms could be so broadly stated that the entire administrative responsibility for the enforcement of the act of March 24, 1943, might be delegated to the Office of Education, the objective so many have been so long seeking, the opposition of the veterans notwithstanding. It is not fear of the words themselves, the words which the Rankin amendment would strike out, that prompts this suggestion; it is fear of the use to which those words could be put by one in official position who might desire to achieve those ends.

Suppose there was somebody in higher authority, higher authority than either Paul McNutt or General Hines possess, and should intimate to the two of them that he would be pleased if they would sign such an agreement. Is there anyone within my hearing so naive as to think that such an agreement would not be forthcoming? The result? The rehabilitation of disabled veterans would be vested in the Office of Education, and the will of the Congress as expressed in the act of March 24 would have been defeated.

General Hines needs none of the authority which this offensive section would enact. Let us not so legislate that he might be compelled to sign an agreement which might render it impossible to do the job we all want him to do—to rehabilitate and retain our heroes, disabled returning veterans—to face successfully what will be, to them, at least, a very different competitive world from

the one they went forth to defend with "all they had."

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. And is it not true that General Hines has stated that it is not necessary to have this provision? The veterans can have their civilian status if they are not disabled by a service-connected disability. He does not need this language. I was talking with General Hines only a few moments ago on the telephone.

Mr. GEARHART. That is entirely correct.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. In just a moment, after I have commented upon the point raised by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

The act of March 24, the act which provides for the rehabilitation of disabled American veterans is complete in every detail, all comprehensive, so to speak. It confers upon General Hines all the authority he needs, all the jurisdiction he requires, to proceed to rehabilitate those veterans suffering from war-connected disabilities; so it is utterly unnecessary that any additional legislation, in this or any other bill, be enacted. General Hines has so expressed himself. That should be the end of it as far as we are concerned.

I am grateful to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts for reporting her conversation with General Hines to us. When he says that this legislation is not necessary, that should settle it.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GEARHART. I yield.

Mr. BARDEN. I am very much afraid the gentleman has overstepped the facts, because half of the money used for this purpose under this bill will be State money, and the very provision the gentleman seeks to strike out provides that if the State takes this money to be approved under this act a State plan for vocational rehabilitation shall make provisions for the facilities to be used by General Hines if he calls for them. We certainly would not have the right to force a State to do something for which there is no provision of law.

Mr. GEARHART. If the gentleman will read section 2 of the act of March 24, 1943, he will find that General Hines has all the authority in himself that Paul McNutt will have, when the instant bill becomes a law, to enter into contracts with the States.

Mr. BARDEN. The law the gentleman refers to states that he may use State and Federal facilities, but when we get to passing a law to make a State spend its own money without its consent it is going too far.

Mr. GEARHART. But where are we going to find constitutional authority to compel a sovereign State to do something its people do not want to do?

Mr. BARDEN. Through the appropriation of money and their acceptance of it.

Mr. GEARHART. That would constitute an agreement, the only way under whichever law we proceed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RANKIN: Page 5, line 7, after the word "duty", strike out down to and including all of line 9.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, in reply to my distinguished friend from New York [Mr. REED], let me say that no man in or out of Congress has more sympathy for the disabled than I have, and especially for the blind.

The other day a question was asked, Who was the outstanding woman in America? My answer was, Helen Keller. I think her accomplishments will go down in history as probably the greatest achievements of any human being in America, considering the handicaps under which she labored.

I am not opposed to, and I have never opposed rehabilitating the disabled, but there is a vast difference between rehabilitating people who have never been able to do anything and rehabilitating veterans who are injured in war and who are compelled thereby to change occupations.

After the last war, through the Veterans' Administration, we put on one of the greatest rehabilitation programs for disabled veterans the world has ever seen. We propose to do the same thing again. But we do not propose to mix the disabled veterans who are to be rehabilitated with all of the vast multitude of people who have never been able to do anything and who have to be rehabilitated and make the veteran the common carrier to rake down the millions or billions of appropriations that will be necessary to carry on that vast program.

I know there has been criticism of the veterans' organizations. I have been chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation for 13 years. I sat at the elbow of Royal Johnson, chairman of that committee, from the time it was organized until he went out of office and I want to say to you that if you do not pass this amendment and leave these veterans in the hands of the Veterans' Administration, as we have provided, you will not only stir up a row that will echo in every post of the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and D. A. V. in America, but I can tell you this bill will not pass the Senate in its present form.

What we are asking you to do by this amendment is what we have asked from the very beginning, and that is not to interfere with the rehabilitation of the disabled veterans of this war. The man who is not disabled as a result of the war in later years will be a civilian, and this bill here would apply to him with these amendments adopted. This encroachment on the Veterans' Administration is not justified and I say it would be a terrible blunder, in my opinion, at this time.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. I wish the gentleman would answer this question. Will the bill that the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] referred to enable the Director of the Veterans' Administration to make these transactions with the various States to rehabilitate the veterans?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; and, also, with private institutions. We saw to that, I will say to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. As this language in the present bill is admittedly surplusage, it can do no more than confuse the situation to leave it in.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; it will not hurt the bill a particle to eliminate it.

Mr. BARDEN. It will not injure his bill one particle to adopt these amendments.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. After the other war I was a member of the Committee on Education of the House and so was Mr. REED. Dr. Fess, of Ohio, was chairman of that committee.

Mr. RANKIN. Do not go into ancient history now. I do not want the gentleman to take up my time.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I want to confirm the gentleman's convictions.

Mr. RANKIN. All right. Go ahead.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The question came up just as it has now. There was vocational training or rehabilitation for those injured in civil life and for the veterans. We brought in two bills and we passed two bills.

Mr. RANKIN. That is right.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. That is what I am in favor of today.

Mr. RANKIN. We separated them and that is what the veterans' organizations are trying to do now.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 5 additional minutes if he so desires.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. May I ask the gentleman if he can tell us this: The service organizations, the Legion, and the V. F. W. have examined the bill. What is their opinion?

Mr. RANKIN. I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that Ted Ray, who now represents the American Legion in Washington, while our friend Mr. Sullivan is in the hospital, came to my office this morning, went over this bill carefully, and said, "By all means these amendments should be adopted and this

language should be stricken out." There also came with him the legislative representative of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Mr. Homer Ketchum, with whom we are all acquainted, and Mr. Ketchum said that by all means these provisions should be stricken out. I read his letter into the RECORD a while ago. There came with him Mr. Millard Rice, representing the Disabled Veterans of the World War, who agreed with them thoroughly, and he gave me a copy of his letter to General Hines. I have just read you the reply of General Hines in which he said this language is not necessary.

Of course, General Hines was not going to come in and oppose any provision of the bill. He is a part of the administration. He did not want to get at loggerheads with Mr. McNutt, who is also another member of the administration. But everybody connected with the veterans' organizations who has gone through this fight all these years knows this provision should be taken out of the bill.

Mr. COMPTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. COMPTON. I want to know if any of these veterans' organizations appeared before the committee to object to this bill?

Mr. RANKIN. The veterans' organizations, when this matter was first considered, became very much disturbed about it. It was their impression that all these provisions that would include the service-connected disabled veterans of this war would be stricken out. Mr. Sullivan is in the hospital, and until a few days ago I was not aware that these provisions would include the very veterans that we have taken care of heretofore.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I want to answer the question that the gentleman just asked.

Mr. RANKIN. Please do not take up my time.

Mr. DONDERO. It is a very singular thing that not until this afternoon did any member of the Committee on Education have any intimation whatever that the veterans were opposed to that provision which the gentleman seeks to strike out by amendment.

If they wanted it out, why did they not say so to the committee at the time that title I was stricken out?

Mr. RANKIN. They thought it was out.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Did the Committee on Education make any attempt to determine what the viewpoint of the veterans was on this point?

Mr. DONDERO. In answer to the gentleman from Ohio, may I say that representatives from the veterans' organizations were before our committee and asked that title I be stricken. We did

that. Had it been suggested that this language was offensive to them, undoubtedly this would have been stricken out at the same time.

Mr. RANKIN. I may say to the gentleman from Michigan that they went before the committee and asked that that provision be stricken from the bill because it did just exactly what these provisions do. The thing you should have done was to have followed it up and wiped out these provisions. The veterans do not want these two provisions in this bill. If they are out the veterans will have no objection to the passage of the bill. But you are about to stir up a conflict of jurisdiction that is going to stir up a row from one end of the country to the other and, in my opinion, your bill will never become a law unless these two amendments are adopted.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. May I ask the chairman of the committee when this bill was printed and made public?

Mr. BARDEN. It was printed May 7, 1943.

Mr. RANKIN. I may say to the gentleman from Iowa that the legislative representative of the American Legion, who has been looking after this proposition, has been in the hospital for several weeks.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I am very much in favor of all legislation pertaining to veterans being kept separate, but there is one thing in this bill that, listening to the debate, concerns me. Under the present veterans' legislation is it possible for one who is not service-connected to get rehabilitation?

Mr. RANKIN. Adopting these amendments would not affect non-service-connected veterans in the future because they would be civilians. It would not affect them at all.

I hope the amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is very strange that this bill has been printed for over a month and those of us on the committee never knew until this afternoon that the veterans' organizations were not in favor of certain provisions of the bill.

Mr. DONDERO. If the gentleman from Minnesota will yield, the bill bears the date of April 19, and then was committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union on May 7, more than a month ago.

Mr. JUDD. I do not understand how this happened because, of course, we worked very closely with the veterans' organizations, or we thought we did. I do not know what their legislative representatives were doing when we had the bill out all this time.

But the point is, if there is objection to this provision, if there really is a ghost under the bed, which I cannot see but which others apparently fear, then I think it should be stricken out. I think it is rather unfortunate that this fight came here this afternoon. Because that provision was put in there, I know, only because we thought it gave more service to the veterans, not less; better, not worse. We wanted to be sure the States would allow their programs, for which they are contributing half the money, to be used by the disabled veterans if requested by the Veterans' Administrator. They probably would do that anyway, but we are saying here in effect to the States, "Unless you allow your State rehabilitation facilities to be used by these veterans when General Hines asks to use them, we will not give you the Federal money to help with your State programs." That was our way of making dead sure that the States in order to get the money from the Government would allow their facilities to be used by the veterans when General Hines asked them to do so. That was solely what we had in mind.

If the bill does not do that—and as the gentleman from Mississippi and I were discussing the other day, sometimes words do have meanings that were not in the mind of the speaker when he uttered them or in the mind of the writer when he wrote them—if this paragraph has the meaning he finds in it, then, I want it stricken out. But Mr. Chairman, I assure the Committee of the Whole House that there was never a thought of that sort in our minds. We thought we were providing better service for the veterans, not worse.

There is one further point I would make. I feel that in general it is far better for the veterans, once they have been examined and their disabilities determined and the treatment and rehabilitation that is necessary decided upon by the Veterans' Administration, not to set up a whole new set of facilities across the street from the ones the State already has, but to use those facilities and train the men there along with their fellow veterans whose disabilities are not service connected and with their fellow civilians.

For 20 years our doctors' offices have been crowded with men who were too long in veterans' hospitals. They became crippled psychologically worse than they were physically. It is almost impossible to get them to fit back into ordinary civilian life. After all, what we are fighting the war for now, it seems to me, is the privilege of being civilians the rest of our lives.

I assure the gentleman from Mississippi that our sole purpose was to try to guarantee better rehabilitation service, not poorer, for the disabled veterans.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I am not questioning the good intentions of the gentleman from Minnesota or the gentleman from North Carolina, but we have provided for every service that is necessary in connec-

tion with the service-connected disabled veterans through the Veterans' Administration, and we not only provide for using these State institutions, we can use them or we can use private institutions; but what we do not want is the conflict of jurisdiction. For that reason we are asking that it be stricken out.

Mr. JUDD. And may I reply to the gentleman, that even if the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs wanted to use a State's facilities, and the State board of vocational education was busy, or filled up with its own trainees, there is no way under Public Law 16 that I know by which you could compel the State to allow the Administrator to use those facilities. This bill would compel the State to make them available, because, in order to get Government money for its own program, the State would have to agree to that.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman has stated definitely the purpose of the committee to be helpful to the veterans, and that General Hines himself has stated that in this way he might be able to avoid duplication of facilities in many cases, and thereby promote economy and assist some rehabilitated disabled veterans.

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. Yes.

Mr. COMPTON. Has the gentleman any fear in his heart about any of the States depriving any of the veterans, whether there was authority or not, from having any rehabilitation that they were able to give? Has the gentleman any fear that that would be done because there was some question of jurisdiction?

Mr. JUDD. No. I hope with all my heart that it would not be, but this would seem to be a guaranty.

Mr. GEARHART. I do not want to be understood as questioning the good intention of the gentleman's committee, in fact I want to record myself as believing just the opposite. The point is this: Would you have included this authority to train disabled American veterans with war-service-connected disability in the present bill if you knew that under Public Law 16 exactly the same authority has been conferred upon the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. JUDD. We would not have put it in, if we thought that covered it. We thought then, and I think now, that Public Law 16 might not adequately cover it. This was to make sure that when the Veterans' Administration wants to negotiate for facilities, the State would have to agree.

Mr. GEARHART. General Hines has precisely the same authority.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield gladly to the majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. Let me make a personal inquiry. The thought enters

my mind to inquire of the gentleman, and we all realize that the committee intended to help the veterans, but there is one basic thought that I am possessed of and I would like to have the gentleman's reaction to it. Why should the States be compelled to take care of disabled veterans? Why is not that the duty and obligation of the Federal Government?

Mr. JUDD. It is not primarily a duty or obligation of the States except as has been said here. We were requiring that the States do it if needed, in order to help out the Veterans' Administration and the veterans. We have been at war a year and a half, and the Veterans' Administration has not yet been able to set up adequate facilities, and these boys are coming back, sometimes several hundred per week, and the idea was to take facilities already established and make them available to the Veterans' Administration now as an emergency—and later whenever the Administrator considered it advantageous. I believe they will generally get better training for return to civilian life and employment if trained along with civilians being trained by the States. When a man's papers are made out in the Veterans' Administration—where all authority would be kept—and the man is assigned for physical therapy or for special training in an occupation, he would get to use the same facilities, already in operation, established, and set up.

Mr. McCORMACK. Coming back to the question of responsibility, and that is what concerns me, our men are serving the United States of America, which, of course, is our Union—the Central Government. If they are disabled, why should not the Central Government assume the responsibility rather than pass it on to the States?

Mr. JUDD. It does under this legislation.

Mr. McCORMACK. Fifty percent under this bill.

Mr. JUDD. Oh, no. Under section 3, under the title "Payments to the States," it reads:

The Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to each State * * * necessary expenditures the sum of amounts he determines to be—

(1) * * * (exclusive of administrative expense) for vocational rehabilitation services provided disabled veterans.

That covers the total cost for veterans.

Subsections (2) and (3) provide one-half of necessary expenditures for rehabilitation services for other individuals. Under subsection 1, if the States train the war-connected disabled veterans at the request of the Veterans' Administrator, then the Government shall reimburse the States in toto for the cost of such training.

Mr. McCORMACK. All right, but why should not the full responsibility be under the Federal Government?

Mr. JUDD. It is; it merely engages and pays for the use of State facilities.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to say to the gentleman from Minnesota that the gen-

tleman from Massachusetts has put his finger on the spot. The Veterans' Administration is authorized to use these State institutions; every State college, and private institution, and these boys are not fighting for the State of Minnesota or for Michigan or for Massachusetts or for Mississippi. They are fighting for the whole United States, and the Veterans' Administration assumes this entire responsibility and, therefore, it is unnecessary to put these service-connected disabled veterans under the provisions here which would involve not only mixing them with the people you are training, and to rehabilitate for the first time, but at the same time unload a part of that responsibility on State facilities. As I have said, this thing is unnecessary; it hampers the bill instead of helping it.

Mr. JUDD. Would the gentleman make the disabled men now coming home wait until whole new facilities can be set up by the Government before they receive training? However, if this language says what the gentleman from Mississippi thinks it says, I am for striking it out. I only wish we had had the information some time ago, for then it would not have been here.

Mr. RANKIN. On that date we were speaking of awhile ago, we were wrong and the gentleman was right about the time it was reported; but, as I said, the head of the American Legion in Washington was in the hospital and it was not called to our attention.

Mr. JUDD. Were the heads of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the Disabled Veterans also in the hospital?

Mr. RANKIN. They had written some letters, but in the rush of correspondence mine had been misplaced, but it was called to my attention only yesterday, and for that reason I brought it to the attention of the House.

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman from Mississippi will agree, I am sure, that it was, after all, somewhat unfortunate that it came before the committee this afternoon for the first time?

Mr. RANKIN. If I had known that this language had not been stricken out at the time they struck out title I, I certainly would have appealed to the committee.

Mr. JUDD. And it would have been stricken out, without question.

Mr. MURPHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MURPHY. Is it not true that there was testimony before the committee that the veterans themselves or their agencies are now using State facilities, existing facilities, and that this was only to avoid the question of duplicating facilities?

Mr. JUDD. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I regret very much that this discussion has reached the point it has. There has been considerable fog turned loose in this House. The Rehabilitation Service has enough

to do. They have a tremendous job and more than they can attend to now. The Veterans' Administration will have its problems. The Veterans' Administration intends to use every single one of these facilities and have so declared. They have already been over with 400 service-connected veterans to contact the Rehabilitation Service, to do the rehabilitation. Now, there is a reason for that, and I wish the Members would listen to this. Here is the report of the rehabilitation work that was done after the last war which, on account of duplication, lack of facilities, and setting up new facilities cost this Government \$5,000 each. That is General Hines' statement. We knew that. Now, they have been rehabilitating, with this organization, for less than \$300. Now, just listen to what we are quarreling about. In the act to which the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] refers—by the way, I wish we would stop and think, that the service-connected disabled constitute only about 10 percent of the veterans needing rehabilitation. We cannot legislate for 10 percent and walk off and leave 90 percent.

In the act to which the gentleman refers they make this reference:

Utilize this or any other governmental agency such as those maintained by joint and Federal contribution.

I am not so sure that we have the right to provide for the expenditure of State money in that way. I am not so sure of that. We were not so sure when we wrote this bill. But we were sure of one thing, and that was that we wanted the veterans to have the best possible service. So what did we do? We said they have put language in Public 16 to provide for the use of this Federal and State contribution program—and they were referring to this rehabilitation program—they put this in the bill, and I wish we could separate all other impressions and get this clear—we put into H. R. 2536 a section known as the State plan, section 2, "to be approvable under this act a State plan for vocational rehabilitation shall"—one of the few things we said to the State they shall do. Now, what is it they shall do? They shall provide that vocational rehabilitation provided under the State plan shall be available under such rules and regulations as the administrator shall prescribe, to any civil employee of the United States, and so forth, and shall be available to any disabled veterans certified pursuant to section 3 (a) 1, which says that they shall take care of any veteran which the Veterans' Administration sends down and certifies that he is entitled to it and makes an agreement as provided in this law for him to be taken care of. Now, that is all there is in it. I am so sure that the American Legion would run like shot cats from any audience of soldiers in America if somebody were to get up and clothe them with responsibility for striking out this provision that we put into this bill. What on earth can they be thinking about?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield briefly.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman says that the law which came out of the World War Veterans' Committee only affects 10 percent of the veterans. That means service-connected disabled veterans. The non-service-connected veterans are covered under the rest of this bill as civilians. But this is the provision that we object to, reaching out and seizing control or seizing jurisdiction of the service-connected disabled veterans that are taken care of in that bill.

Mr. BARDEN. I challenge the gentleman's statement. I challenge the statement of any man on this floor who says there is a word that reaches out and takes jurisdiction. The only reaching done was in Public, No. 16, when they reached out and said they were going to spend State and Federal money. The gentleman from Mississippi would be as helpless as a baby to spend a dollar of Mississippi's money under his act, without the consent of the State of Mississippi. Therefore, to correct a very apparent error in the act to which the gentleman refers—Public, No. 16—we put in the State plan, that a State in submitting its plan shall make provision to take care of any service-connected veteran that General Hines sends down and certifies and orders taken care of and makes agreements to pay, and so forth. You cannot make anything else out of this, and I challenge any statement by any Member and I challenge him to prove it, that there is a word in this bill that attempts to take any jurisdiction of any service-connected veteran.

Did they previously make an arrangement that they did not make under that act? I am not a constitutional lawyer. There seems to be about 400 in the House, but I am not one of them. I do say that the State, when it is putting its money in, should have control. I do not think the gentleman could say with one stroke you are going to spend State money.

It is not going to ruin that program. It is not going to hurt the veterans; it is going to put the States in a position where they can say whether or not they want to take care of these men.

I want it distinctly understood where the responsibility for striking out this language is, if it is stricken out: I want it known where the responsibility rests. I want no part of it, and I do not take any other interpretation from any man who may be downtown, and I would suggest to them, the American Legion representatives, and they have been up to my office and talked with me. I never got any impression from them that they were not satisfied with this bill, or with this section. I think there has been some confusion here or there.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. GEARHART. Veterans' organizations have done everything in their power, not in the last few days as some

people have seemed to understand, but for a period of 2 years, and they have been going to the Committee on Education and to the World War Veterans' Committee.

Mr. BARDEN. Will the gentleman stick to the matter under discussion. I know what they have done and what they have not done, and that the Legion representatives, the only two I know, Mr. Sullivan and Mr. Stubblefield, have not raised this issue with me—and to do so at this time strikes me as being ill-timed and ill-considered.

Mr. GEARHART. Is it not true that for 2 years the representatives of the veterans' organizations have come to your committee, every one of them, and told you they wanted you to drop all of this education to disabled veterans: that the veterans did not want this?

Mr. BARDEN. Let me say this: Right now this Congress, and you and I have been a part of it, we have had the responsibility for looking after this program for the veterans. This Congress, when the session started this year, did not have before it any such legislation; the Veterans' Committee did not make a move until the latter part of last year. The veterans' bill to take care of the 10 percent disabled has been passed. That was to take care of the disabled, and it is this program, the rehabilitation program, that is saving the veterans today.

Mr. GEARHART. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. It is the administration of this program.

Mr. GEARHART. How has this legislation saved the disabled, when it has not even been enacted, and when the veterans' bill is already the law and was signed by the President on March 24, 1943?

Mr. BARDEN. This bill amends the basic act. The disabled have been rehabilitated and trained for the last several months under the State-Federal rehabilitation program. Does not the gentleman know that there are a lot of veterans now who are being trained under the State-Federal program, where the States are paying for the training, and where there is no provision for reimbursement?

Mr. RANKIN. Not those with service disabilities.

Mr. BARDEN. Absolutely; and the record will support this statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last paragraph.

Mr. Chairman, the House knows that the World War Veterans Committee has been working upon rehabilitation for some months and finally secured the passage of legislation.

I would like to read the testimony of Millard Rice, given in February 1943. This is in response to a question by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES], in which he said:

I believe that the movement was started by those who want to bring about the process of levelization in this country, taking off the hill tops and filling in the valleys; and

the first vulnerable point would be the leveling of the benefits allowed to veterans as compared to other needy citizens purely on the basis of need.

One of the processes of levelization is between the handicapped disabled veterans and the handicapped disabled civilians, leveling them off through the Federal Security Administration. The second is the levelization through the entire country.

Then Mr. Rice goes on to say that it has to be separate and apart.

I have just talked to General Hines and he told me that he does not need this legislation for his purpose.

I would like to point out to the committee that if the Veterans' Administration has to go to the Social Security Administration for its appropriation there will be a great deal of delay in the training of veterans. Going back to World War No. 1, at the time the rehabilitation program was established, the rehabilitation of veterans was handled through vocational training. I was visiting with the disabled veterans at that time. In the hospitals it was difficult to help a man to take that training; there was a great deal of delay because you had the Veterans' Administration to deal with, the War Risk Insurance, and you had also a Vocational Training Bureau. There was a great deal of delay in organization and securing appropriations. Only 10 percent of the disabled veterans will come under the social-security program. The other 90 percent of disabled veterans who are serving their country, will go back to their civilian status and will be taken care of in that way. I can see no need for this. I shall support the amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

I should like to compliment the gentleman from North Carolina on the fine job he and the members of his committee are doing in this rehabilitation work. It is greatly needed and very necessary, but we do not want this provision for the service-connected veterans in the bill. This is no time to take away from the Veterans' Administration any of its prerogatives. This is the first one. If this succeeds others will follow and you will gradually weaken that Administration so that the World War veterans will be classed with other civilians, and not veterans.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. The reference the gentleman made a moment ago to the conversation she had with General Hines, as I understood it, was to the effect that General Hines said they did not need the provisions we propose to strike out of the bill.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. He said he was not offering objections but he did not need them to carry on his work; he was perfectly satisfied. He was not opposing the committee and I can see why he would not want to, but he does not need that provision in the bill.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. If this amendment is passed is there any question in the gentleman's mind but what the Congress will pass all the legislation necessary to take care of veterans?

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am positive of that. We have such a law on the statute books at the present time for the service-connected cases.

Mr. JENSEN. And we will give that power to the Veterans' Administration where it justly belongs.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. And, of course, the veterans know that. It seems to me this is a very important amendment.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. I just wanted to read from another part of the bill to confirm a thing which has been said several times, namely, that the Committee on Education inserted these provisions only because it believed it will make sure the facilities of the States would be available for veterans when requested. I refer to section 4, on page 9, which reads:

Whenever the Administrator, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State board, finds that in the administration of the plan there is—

Omitting (1)—

A failure to afford reasonable cooperation with other Federal and State agencies providing vocational rehabilitation or similar services, the Administrator shall notify such State board that further payments will not be made to the State under this act until he is satisfied that there will no longer be any such failure.

I quote that merely as corroboration of the point we are trying to make that these services would have to be rendered to the Veterans' Administration by the States if requested by the former.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. He has power to set up the machinery under the bill the Congress has already passed, and that has become law.

Mr. JUDD. He is not actually carrying on this rehabilitation program as yet.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. He has administered veterans' rehabilitation in the past.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. IAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, one of the previous speakers said it would be wise to let the men speak for themselves. I happen to be a service-connected disabled veteran, and speaking for my post, the World War Amputation Post in New York City, I wish to express these thoughts: That they want to be left alone where they are because they are in very happy surroundings. It is true that after the last war, when the Veterans' Committee was formed to administer to the veterans of the last war, when the Veterans' Administration tried to make pocketbook makers out of motormen and jewelers out of shoemakers, they made plenty of mistakes because they were new and they were young; but as they went along they saw the plight of the disabled veteran.

They listened to his needs and they served every interest which he desired.

Although these various veterans' organizations have not appeared before the committee in its consideration of this bill, the hour is not too late. This Congress has, since the last war, given ear to all the veterans' organizations in the legislation which they have sought, and surely now, even at this last hour, you must have heard, as I have, that the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the World War Disabled American Veterans, do not want this. I ask you in their name, I ask you as a rehabilitated disabled veteran, to listen to them and to favor the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to see if we cannot arrive at a limitation of time. I believe we have overemphasized things a little here, that there is not half so much danger as some seem to think.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close within 20 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I modify my request and ask that all debate on the pending amendment close in 30 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, there are 10 Members standing who want time. The House gladly listened to the chairman of the committee and gave him an additional 5 minutes, and have listened to all others for 5 minutes. We can well afford to spend an hour on this subject because it is an important amendment to the veterans and the men of this war. I object to anything less than 5 minutes to each Member who wishes time on this amendment.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my request.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the only reason I come to the rostrum on this occasion is, as I stated previously, that I have heard from Pennsylvania, and on no occasion did I hear any protest against the provisions of this bill.

When the legislative representative of the American Legion was before our committee, and I refer to Mr. Sullivan, I took it upon myself to make sure that Mr. Sullivan had every opportunity so that he could amplify his remarks, and I asked the committee to agree that he might do so in writing at a later date.

The first I heard of any objection to this particular provision covered by the pending amendment was this afternoon. At the present time the Veterans' Administration is using the existing facilities in the several States. General Hines was before our committee and other representatives, and the intent and purport of the testimony of the representatives of the service organizations was to request that we strike out title I. Title I was stricken out. The provision now under discussion was put in the bill

merely for the purpose of protecting the veterans so that there would be some compulsion instead of merely a moral responsibility on the States to make existing facilities available for training veterans instead of the necessity of having duplications.

If, however, the veterans feel that they would prefer to have General Hines use moral persuasion rather than the Federal Government use financial persuasion, that is, withholding it in order to get the use of existing facilities, I am perfectly agreeable. If it will help remove any possibility of this bill not becoming law at the earliest possible date, I would agree to the amendments although I do not see how the language in any way can hurt the veterans.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, there is one thing that every veteran of the World War will agree to and that is that the hospitalization, the treatment, the rehabilitation of men who are disabled during a period of war is absolutely the responsibility of the Federal Government and until they are completely rehabilitated that responsibility should not be spread over the 48 different States. It has been said that under this program the Director of Veterans' Affairs would certify to the State of Connecticut in regard to a Connecticut veteran that John Smith has received the maximum benefit of hospitalization and is now eligible for vocational training. "We turn him over to you in competition with those who have suffered industrial accidents and with others who may need vocational training," and under the direction of the State supervisor he would receive that training. The Federal Government for the time being drops him until such time as his training is completed. If he still has a disability which has not been compensated by his training he may or may not be later picked up by the Veterans' Administration. We do not want that kind of a situation.

It was the understanding of the veterans' organizations, and I talked with their representatives, that when title I was stricken out of the original bill all reference to the service-connected disabled veteran was removed from this bill. I think there is some confusion in our thinking when we use the word "veteran." The man who serves in this war and who will be a veteran at the end of this war, and who later suffers an industrial accident will, of course, be entitled to the benefits of this act and will receive all such benefits. But so far as the man who is suffering from a service-connected disability is concerned the Federal Government must assume that responsibility.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. When General Hines appeared before our committee I asked him this question:

General, why should the Committee on Education be dealing with veterans' affairs?

He answered:

They will not be if this bill passes. The Veterans' Administration will be handling it. We will be using some of their facilities.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Yes; they will be using some of their facilities. Which is as it should be providing that control is maintained by the Veterans' Administration and not the State.

Mr. DONDERO. I simply quote that to show that in committee we raised the question why we should be dealing with Veterans' Administration affairs.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. If the question could be put to the House now the members of the committee, or many of them, and the majority of the Members of the House would strike this section out so that there would be no question about it.

Mr. HINSHAW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. In view of the fact that everyone agrees that if this is going to in any way conflict with the Veterans' Administration operation of the rehabilitation program, I see no reason why the committee should not accept the amendment without any further argument.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I wish the members of that committee would accept the Rankin amendment. If the committee would accept it, there could be no question about it later.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. That is the point I want to bring out. The adoption of my amendment will not cripple this bill in any way whatsoever. The non-service-connected veteran who will later come in as a civilian may take advantage of it.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Absolutely.

Mr. RANKIN. It will eliminate a conflict that is going to be confusing, dangerous, and damaging to the service-connected disabled veteran.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 3 minutes on another subject.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate that this controversy has come up in connection with this bill because we were all quite happy at having this bill before us, as it deals with an important subject, a subject that is very close to my heart. I refer to the rehabilitation of men who suffer from disability, whether it is from war or from an industrial accident.

Earlier in the day reference was made to the amount of money that might be needed. I hope this program can be permitted to grow just as rapidly as it is possible to obtain trained personnel, and no more rapidly than that, because if we do not get the right kind of personnel to handle and carry into effect this legislation we might do a great deal of harm to

not only the disabled veterans but to disabled civilians. I hope that when this war comes to an end and the Veterans' Administration writes its regulations to carry into effect the acts we pass, there will be one expression stricken from their regulations and that is the expression "permanently and totally disabled." I do not want to see the Veterans' Administration or any other agency of the Government ever to say to a man, even though it might possibly be true, and to have him declared on the records of the Federal Government, that he is permanently and totally disabled, because, unfortunately, there are thousands who are so psychologically constituted that they believe it. They believe that because the Veterans' Administration has formally declared them permanently and totally disabled they are on the shelf for the rest of their life, and it is tragedy when a man does accept that interpretation.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. That provision was never written into any veterans' law until after the First World War, when it was written into the Sweet bill in 1921 before the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation was created.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I wish that could be dropped from all regulations.

In closing, I want to express this additional thought, and it does not apply to any member of this committee. There are those in Washington who would like to see the care and treatment of the veterans of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2 made a part of the social-security program. There are State directors of this rehabilitation program who would like by hook or by crook to bring under their control the training of disabled veterans. Why? Because they know that when they go to their legislatures if they are able to say that part of the money they are asking for is going to be used to train men who were incapacitated in the war, they know that they will get their appropriations much more easily than they would if this language were not in the bill. So I hope that to remove all doubt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi will be adopted.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, the committee has, of course, presented its views. This piece of legislation is entirely too important to be misconstrued. The committee does not now think the bill will be any better if these amendments are adopted. We think the boys now on the battlefields and the veterans' organizations will be injured more than the bill. But in the interest of conserving the time of the House, and in order to get this program going throughout the country, I have conferred with the minority members and many of the other members of the committee and their opinion is that if we are going to be misunderstood and the Washington representatives of the American Legion and the other veterans' organizations want to assume the full responsibility for the removal of this language, I should submit

a unanimous-consent request that the provisions referred to be stricken in accordance with the amendments offered. It will not hurt the bill.

I believe the gentleman from Mississippi proposes to offer another amendment. I ask unanimous consent that these amendments may be read in order that we may strike the exact language. I think we can accept them by unanimous consent and avoid a lot of trouble and misunderstanding over what the chairman thinks is a very, very excellent piece of legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendments of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Mr. RANKIN: On page 5, line 7, after the word "duty", strike out down to and including all of line 9.

Amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. RANKIN: On page 6, beginning with the word "for", in line 4, strike out down to and including line 9.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that these two amendments be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that the two amendments which have been reported by the Clerk as offered by the gentleman from Mississippi be adopted. Is there objection?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, if these two amendments are adopted then will we have met the objections of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Disabled American Veterans, and will we also have met the objections of the members of the House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation?

Mr. RANKIN. That is correct.

Mr. BARDEN. If the gentleman is asking me, I say not as presented to the committee; and I want it distinctly understood, and the Committee on Education wants it distinctly understood, that these organization representatives must assume full responsibility for these amendments. We do not cherish any part of it.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I said it would meet the objections raised by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Legion, the Disabled American Veterans, and the members of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation of the House. Is not that correct?

Mr. BARDEN. I will let the gentleman assume that.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi is to cut out all of paragraph 1 on page 6 except a line and a half. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be modified to strike out the entire paragraph, and that the numbers of the succeeding paragraph be corrected.

Mr. RANKIN. That will be all right, Mr. Chairman; beginning with line 3, strike out all of lines 3 to 9, inclusive.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina that the two amendments submitted by the gentleman from Mississippi be adopted?

There was no objection.

So the amendments were agreed to.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARDEN: On page 10, line 12, after the words "agreements with", insert the words "two or more."

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, in this paragraph we were dealing with agreements with two or more State boards. The printer simply left out the words "two or more." This amendment is to correct that error.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WILLEY: On page 10, line 2, strike out the comma and insert in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "or."

After line 2 of page 10 insert the following:

"(3) A denial of vocational rehabilitation on account of race, creed, or color."

On page 10, line 5, after "failure", insert "or denial."

Mr. WILLEY. Mr. Chairman, this particular amendment is offered for insertion under section 4, after line 2, page 10, of the bill, H. R. 2536, now under consideration by the House. The amendment is to strike out the comma where it appears after the word "services" and at the end of line 2, page 10, of the bill to insert in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "or", and after said line 2, to insert the following:

(3) A denial of vocational rehabilitation on account of race, creed, or color.

Section 2 of the bill provides that there shall be a State plan for vocational rehabilitation approved by the Administrator.

Section 4 of the bill provides that if the Administrator should find that certain requirements of said plan have not been met by the State affected and if he is not satisfied that there will no longer be any such failure that said Administrator shall make no further certification to the Secretary of the Treasury and thus the State affected would be denied Federal funds. Part 1 of section 4 mentions a failure to comply substantially with any provision required by section 2 to be included in the State plan for vocational rehabilitation, which must be approved by Federal authority, or any restriction on expenditures imposed in conflict with section 2.

Part 2 of section 4 refers to a failure to afford reasonable cooperation with other Federal and State agencies providing vocational rehabilitation or similar services. The addition of part 3 provided by this amendment simply means that in the operation under State plans as federally approved that it must be shown there has been no denial of vocational rehabilitation on account of race, creed, or color.

The other part of this amendment is to insert in line 5 on page 10 of the bill, after the word "failure", being the last

word in said line, the words "or denial." The present line means that the Administrator will notify a State board that further payments to the State under this act will not be made if there is a failure to comply with the terms of the act. This part of the amendment simply means that there must be no failure to comply with the terms of the act and no denial of the benefits of vocational rehabilitation on account of race, creed, or color.

Reviewing some of the legislation passed in recent years, it is found that provisions having a similar effect to the amendment proposed here have been inserted in a number of measures, of which the following are examples:

Fifty-third Statutes 855, Civil Aeronautics Act, 1938: "Provided, That in the administration of this act, none of the benefits of training or programs shall be denied on account of race, creed, or color."

Public Law 163, Seventy-fifth Congress, approved June 28, 1937, Civilian Conservation Corps, section 8: "Provided, That the Director may exclude from enrollment such classes of persons as he may consider detrimental to the well-being or welfare of the Corps; except that no person shall be excluded on account of race, color, or creed."

Selective service law, Public Law No. 783, approved December 20, 1941, section 4 (a): "Provided, That in the selection and training of men under this act, there shall be no discrimination against any person on account of race or color."

Thus, it appears by various laws enacted by the Congress in recent years that there is ample precedent for the inclusion of the words which are offered to be added to the pending bill by this amendment.

Also, there is no desire or attempt here to offer this amendment from the floor to the exclusion of committee consideration. The simple fact is the matter was not suggested until after the bill had been reported. It would have been more satisfactory for us to bring this question to the attention of the committee for action by its membership and before the bill had been finally reported out.

It is suggested that the reasons which impelled the Congress to insert the quoted language in the various measures which are here cited are just as urgent today as they were when Congress acted upon these other measures.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I regret very much that that amendment has even been offered. This program has been running for 23 years. There has never been the slightest inference of any discrimination. When this man, Ed Brown, who is some kind of a lobbyist around here, and who has been discussed on this floor before, came to me with that suggestion I said to him, "Why raise the issue, why do you want to render that disservice?" I was very anxious because I have a great deal of interest in the subject matter which this attempts to deal with. I led the fight in the State of North Carolina to increase the appropriation for colored schools, and I am not going to permit any discrimination. I went to the trouble of finding out some figures. If there is any discrimination, it is the other way. In the District of Columbia 25 percent of the rehabilitation cases are of colored people. In South

Carolina it is 23.8 percent. So, if there is any discrimination, I am sure it is the other way, and I am afraid that this amendment will render a disservice if it is agreed to. There has never been the slightest controversy. The issue has never been raised. I certainly hope in this one grand program, that has been operated so economically and so efficiently, that there will be no interference of that kind. When Brown was discussing this he told me that he had not had one single complaint and had not heard one complaint about this department. Why raise the issue? It does not seem appropriate.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. Of course, this amendment would just kill the bill. If the gentleman wants to destroy this legislation, that is the way to do it. Let me say to the gentleman from Delaware—and I am sure if the people of Delaware understood the matter they would see it in this light—in one of the meetings we had a great row over building hospitals for colored veterans, and the two men that led the fighting and held the committee in session until 2 o'clock in the morning were Dick Wilson from South Carolina and your humble servant. The men from the other sections of the country ridiculed us, but we stood with them until we got that settled.

Mr. BARDEN. I just hope that we will not carry this argument along, but let us vote on this and get through with the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Delaware.

The question was taken and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I rise to congratulate the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], chairman of the House Veterans Affairs Committee, for his success and alertness in looking out after the wishes of the veterans' organizations of the country. As I understand it, the gentleman from Mississippi has contended today that various service organizations have asked that they be excluded altogether from the terms of this bill. I understand that they prefer to be treated separately and to have their own program, and that that is what the committee agreed upon a few moments ago.

Whether this is wise or unwise, it seems to represent the wishes of some veterans in my State.

I do want to say to the chairman of the Committee on Education, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] that I am strongly for his bill, but that I have received communications from ex-service groups in Arizona asking to have their program of rehabilitation kept separate and apart from this general rehabilitation legislation. I will take only a moment of your time here

to indicate to the membership, as I have already indicated privately to the chairman of the Veterans Affairs Committee, that such is a request I have received from Arizona.

While I am on my feet I want to say that the rehabilitation program, which has been carried out so effectively throughout the entire country under its present auspices, has been very successfully done in Arizona. Even some in Arizona who are blind in sight have been trained to do war work in airplane factories and in other war plants in a most satisfactory and efficient manner. These blind and formerly helpless citizens are now doing their share and have become a real asset to their community and Nation.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I arise in support of this bill, H. R. 2536. I am not now a member of the Committee on Education. I have not heard anyone say how many persons will be rehabilitated annually under this bill if adopted.

Mr. BARDEN. I might say to the gentleman, if he is directing the question to me, at the present time I understand there are now about 75,000 cases being handled by the States and the Veterans' Administration. How much more that will be I am unable to say. I ask the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] how many cases are being handled?

Mr. DONDERO. Three hundred and thirty thousand since this program was inaugurated in 1920.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. As I have understood you gentlemen, there have been handled about 330,000 cases under this program, and there are about 75,000 now being handled by the States and the Veterans' Administration. What has been the average cost per case?

Mr. BARDEN. It has been less than \$300, and in handling that number of people it might be interesting to say that in this entire Department in Washington there are only 22 employees.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. That is a very fine record of economy and efficiency. Have these 330,000 people been rehabilitated under this program?

Mr. DONDERO. As I stated, there have been 330,000. Over 200,000 have been rehabilitated.

Mr. LANHAM. Approximately 175,000 of those have been put back into gainful occupation.

Mr. DONDERO. Yes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. This bill proposes to amend the act providing for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation for persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment, approved June 2, 1920. At that time, I was a member of the Committee on Education of the House, and so was Mr. REED who has spoken so ably and eloquently in behalf of this program today. Dr. Simeon D. Fess, of Ohio, was chairman of the committee. The Republicans had control of the House and a majority of the Committee on Education.

Our committee, after extensive hearings, reported favorably to the House a bill which became the act of June 2, 1920. This measure met with serious

opposition in the House. Many Members of the House, especially from Virginia and other Southern States, took the position that Congress had no power under the Constitution to pass such an act and this act would invade the rights of the States. This view was ably presented by one of Virginia's great constitutional lawyers and one of the very ablest Members of the House. It was my pleasure and good fortune to urge that it was constitutional and our Federal Government should enter upon this policy to reclaim from the human scrap heap the physically disabled and make them self-supporting citizens. It is very gratifying to me to know that at least 175,000 of the lame, the halt, the blind, and the other physically handicapped have been rehabilitated and put into gainful occupations. It is one of the finest, noblest, best, and most humane policies ever adopted by the Federal Government. I strongly favor this bill in the hope that through the years even a greater number may be rehabilitated and become happy, prosperous, and self-sustaining citizens.

After World War No. 1 the question came up of providing vocational and other training for the rehabilitation of disabled veterans of that war. There were some who at that time, as they have today, insisted that the veterans disabled in service and persons disabled in industry should be trained under the same program; that is, the Federal Government cooperate with the States—contributing for that purpose. Many of us on the Committee on Education in the House took the position that the rehabilitation of veterans was a program solely for the Federal Government. They were injured or lost their health while serving the Nation as a whole, and therefore it was a matter to be handled solely and only by the Nation as a whole, and their rehabilitation should not depend upon the action of any individual State or community. It was the Nation's program, and our Committee on Education in the House brought out a bill for the rehabilitation of disabled veterans of World War No. 1, and another bill which became the act of June 2, 1920, for the rehabilitation of those who received their injuries or disabilities in civilian life and not in the armed service. Both of these measures were adopted by the Congress, and this measure merely amends the act of June 2, 1920.

The act of March 1943 provides rehabilitation for veterans who are disabled in the service of our country in World War No. 2. This bill, H. R. 2536, includes those disabled in the armed service as well as those disabled in civilian life. I did not believe after World War No. 1 that the veterans and those injured in civil life should be rehabilitated under the same program, and I am still of that same opinion, and in this I am in accord with the position of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans' organization, the chairman and other members of the Veterans' Committee of the House, and the various veterans who have expressed similar views here today.

I want the veterans rehabilitated under the act we passed in March 1943, and if that requires any amendment to give complete and adequate service to our disabled veterans of World War No. 2, I know the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House will bring out such amendments and Congress will adopt them and I therefore favor the amendments that have been offered by Mr. RANKIN, chairman of the Veterans' Committee of the House, striking certain sections of the bill on pages 5 and 6.

I wish to say, in my opinion, that the members of the Committee on Education that brought this bill out and included the veterans had but one purpose and that is to be helpful to the veterans and, I am sure, that if there had been presented to the Committee on Education of the House the objections of the veterans' organizations, and the facts that have been presented here today, the Committee on Education would have stricken those portions from the bill. Mr. BARDEN, Mr. DONDERO and other members of the committee had agreed to these amendments.

It is quite clear there has been no desire on their part except to do the very best thing to help the veterans in every way possible. I am gratified to see this fine spirit of cooperation. The Vocational Training Act for the veterans of World War No. 1 was likewise a decided success. Under that program thousands and thousands of disabled veterans were rehabilitated. Mr. Fay, a Member of this House, who was disabled in World War No. 1, was trained under that program and made a very eloquent plea here today for the bill. That program developed a great many able lawyers, physicians, surgeons, dentists, machinists, mechanics, farmers, and scores of others in useful professions and occupations.

After the present war there will be hundreds of thousands of disabled men and women who have heroically defended our country. We must improve this training so that we may rehabilitate every one of these disabled veterans whose rehabilitation and vocational training is feasible. The blind can be made to see and the lame and halt can be made to walk again so far as earning power and usefulness are concerned. The scrap heap will be large enough and we can render no greater service than rehabilitate and reclaim each and every one of these whose rehabilitation is feasible.

With the adoption of the Rankin amendments I can and do give to this measure my wholehearted support and, unlike in 1920, I doubt if there will be a vote against it.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARDEN: On page 6, line 18, strike out all of line 18, down to and including the figure 1 in line 19.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I find by reading the bill after the adoption of an amendment a few minutes ago, there should have been stricken another line which was referred to in that amendment. It is beginning on line 18, the

parenthesis "other than those with respect to whom payments are made under paragraph (1)."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I take this time in order to ask one or two questions with reference to this bill. Do I understand that under the provisions of this bill provision is made for increasing the Federal contribution to the State administrative costs of this rehabilitation program?

Mr. BARDEN. That is the only possible increase covered in this bill which the committee thought was justified by other circumstances.

Mr. KEEFE. My interest in this proposition lies in the fact that I conceive it to be the function of the Federal Government to provide the funds for the administration in the States of this program which is essentially a Federal program, although administered locally in the States. I want to be certain that in this bill, which I have not had time to read carefully, provision is made to take care of the administrative expenses out of Federal grants.

Mr. BARDEN. That is right.

Mr. KEEFE. That is correct; is it not?

Mr. BARDEN. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. KEEFE. Can the gentleman say how much it is anticipated this program will cost?

Mr. BARDEN. That has been discussed previously, but the history of it has been that it has been costing approximately \$6,000,000; \$3,000,000 for the States and \$3,000,000 for the Federal Government. It is on the increase now, and the Administrator makes a fairly conservative estimate. He thinks that the estimate, under this act, if it is adopted right away, might reach approximately \$12,000,000. That is, \$6,000,000 for each. But at the peak, when those injured in industry and the soldiers out of the Army begin to come in, he anticipates it might reach as high as \$22,000,000 a year.

Mr. KEEFE. Is it anticipated that this legislation will be passed so as to enable the Administrator to put this request before the Appropriations Committee to make it effective in the next fiscal year?

Mr. BARDEN. We are hoping to. You see, the program is operating now.

Mr. KEEFE. Oh, I understand that.

Mr. BARDEN. We are trying to get this done as quickly as possible.

Mr. KEEFE. The reason I am interested is because the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of which I happen to be a member will have charge of this particular appropriation, and I am interested to see to it that proper authority is given so that this expanded program may get into operation at the very earliest date.

I want to say to the gentleman that as far as my State is concerned I think it will be conceded, as indicated in the report, that it has been in the forefront for years in the matter of handling this

particular phase of the rehabilitation of people who have been injured, who have been taken out as the result of industrial or other accidents. I want to say that the State supervisor of vocational rehabilitation representing my State has very unequivocally indicated that it has the complete support of the people of Wisconsin. I am glad to say that I shall vote for this bill in its present form.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired. The pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, if there are no further amendments, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GORE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 2536, and, pursuant to House Resolution 247, reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1258. An act to name certain locks in the St. Marys River at the falls, Michigan.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2714) entitled "An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the House amendment to the Senate amendment numbered 5 to said bill, with an amendment as follows:

At the end of the matter inserted by the House amendment, after "Services", insert "or the Federal Bureau of Investigation."

The message also announced that the Senate further insists upon its disagreement to Senate amendment numbered 5 as amended, and Senate amendments numbered 60 and 61 to said bill, asks a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. McKellar, Mr.

GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NYE, and Mr. LODGE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

NAVY DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL FOR 1944

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, before presenting my unanimous-consent request, I desire to advise the Members and the Speaker that I have taken this matter up with the majority and minority leaders and with the members of the committee, and with that understanding I am asking unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2713) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the Naval Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. SHEPPARD, THOMAS of Texas, COFFEE, WHITTEN, DITTER, PLUMLEY, and JOHNSON of Indiana.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks. I also ask unanimous consent that the Members who spoke on the bill H. R. 2536 be permitted to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein a statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] be allowed to extend his remarks in the Record and to include therein a statement by Paul Mutamen, chairman, Iron County Agricultural Mobilization Committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein an article by Maj. Willard B. Cole. I have submitted this copy to the Government Printing Office and I am informed that it will take four pages and will cost about \$180.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the insertion may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include therein an address by the President of Pan-American World Airways System, Juan T. Trippe.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include therein a newspaper article from the New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE WAVES AND THE WAAC'S

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include as part of my remarks a release made to the press this morning by Secretary of War Stimson, and also a letter from Major General Surles regarding the number of WAAC's who have been returned from Africa.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in an effort to stop some of these fantastic and vicious rumors that have been going about regarding the conduct of the WAAC's—and, of course, about the WAVES, the nurses, and other women in uniform—I heard only yesterday that 21 of the WAAC's had been returned from Africa because of misconduct; in fact, I heard that a whole shipload of WAAC's had been returned—there have only been something like 250 WAAC's in Africa and General Surles writes me that only one was returned because she was having a baby. She was married; it was perfectly legitimate. One was being returned for medical attention, for a recurrent physical disability; and 1 was returned because of unsuitable temperament. Only 3 have been returned, and none for improper conduct or improper reasons.

The Congress of the United States should be the first to stop slander upon our patriotic women.

I know the Members of the House will join me in stopping any misinformation or false rumors that are being spread, because if you destroy even by implication the character of the womanhood of America you not only impair the war effort but you destroy America. If you destroy the character of the future mothers of America, you are destroying our entire country.

I invite your attention to the following press release by the Secretary of War and letter from Major General Surles:

STATEMENT BY THE SECRETARY OF WAR AT PRESS CONFERENCE, JUNE 10, 1943

My attention has been attracted to sinister rumors aimed at destroying the reputation of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps. I refer to charges of immorality and particularly to the allegation that the War Department has agreed to the issuance of contraceptives and prophylactic equipment to the members of this corps. I wish to state that these rumors are absolutely and completely false.

The record of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps speaks for itself. Since July 1942 approximately 65,000 fine, patriotic women have enrolled themselves in this corps. And every one of these women who has gone to duty in the field has released a soldier for front-line duty. This is the equivalent of 4 combat divisions already. To appraise that, I remind you that our combat ground forces of the Tunisian campaign consisted of just 4 divisions.

The authorized strength of this corps is 150,000 and since the objective behind the enlistment of the corps is to relieve able-bodied soldiers for combat duty, you can well see that we are speaking now of a sizable increase in our fighting forces.

The enemy naturally is interested in our combat strength—the force by which we shall

eventually bring him to unconditional surrender. Anything which would interfere with their recruiting or destroy the reputation of this corps and, by so doing, interfere with increase in the combat strength of our Army would be of value to that enemy. The repetition of any unfounded rumor concerning this corps lessens confidence in it and is actually an aid to the enemy.

Furthermore, any reflection on the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps is in essence a reflection on the whole of American womanhood; for these 65,000 women are a cross-section of the womanhood of our Nation. They are the teachers who taught your children; the wives, sweethearts, sisters, and even mothers of the men who are today fighting to save our freedom. When they are maligned, when vicious rumor destroys their reputations, the effects could reach into our very front lines, injuring the morale of the Army itself. The story of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps is already a fine chapter in the story of American womanhood, and I emphasize the fact that I have made a thorough investigation of these rumors. They are completely false.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, June 10, 1943.

HON. EDITH N. ROGERS,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MRS. ROGERS: In answer to your query as to the number of members of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps who have been returned from Africa, I can report as follows as of this date:

Three members of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps have been returned from Africa:
One for pregnancy, married, legitimate.
One for medical attention as result of recurrence of gall bladder ailment.
One unsuitable temperament, incapable of adjustment to conditions.

A. D. SURLS,
Major General, United
States Army, Director.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, along the lines of the statement made by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, I wish to bring to the attention of the House so that any rumors may be dispelled, that we had occasion a few days ago to have officials of the Navy Department in front of a subcommittee and we inquired into some matters that have been circulating around town.

I want to report to the House, speaking on behalf of the Navy Department, that of the 16,000 enlisted young women of the United States in the United States Navy Auxiliary but 3 have been dismissed from the service because of misconduct. I think this record speaks for itself. As a matter of fact the women in the service are so far below the men insofar as dismissals are concerned that there is no comparison; the rate in our enlisted male personnel is a great deal higher.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, it would seem unnecessary for any politician, bureaucrat, Army, Navy, or other

officer to say anything in defense of the women in or out of our service. All of us had mothers; most of us have wives, daughters or sisters; so what is the sense in giving any publicity to any rumors which question the ability, the loyalty, the virtue of our women? We all know better. Why not let it go at that? Our women are women, American women, regardless of the uniform they wear. They need no defense from anyone.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

A LITTLE COMMON SENSE—A LITTLE JUSTICE—LESS USE OF THE WRECKING MACHINERY

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, today, Thursday, June 10, 1943, a group of Senators and Congressmen from the eastern seaboard are questioning Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes. They insist that if the East is to continue to support the war effort they must have more gasoline and, next winter, more fuel oil.

They ask that the Middle West, where at the moment there seems to be an abundance of gasoline, be further rationed. They insist that approximately the same restrictions relating to the consumption of gasoline which are now in force in the East be imposed upon the Middle West.

To the Representatives of the Middle West it seems unfair to require that their constituents be deprived of gasoline or fuel oil merely because transportation or storage difficulties now, for the moment, make it impossible for the East to receive all the gasoline or fuel oil needed.

Let us avoid any discussion which will tend to promote sectional feeling. Let us turn rather to the basic cause of all, or at least the greater part, of our domestic trouble. The reason for much of the burden of the inconvenience, and of the rules, regulations, and directives which are hindering not only industrial production but the production of food is the determination of the New Dealers to remake not only our form of government but our whole economic structure.

Coming from a Republican, that statement might be challenged as the result of political bias, but last week Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL, a blown-in-the-bottle Democrat, exasperated by O. P. A. regulations which threatened the poultry industry in his State, made the statement that responsible officials in the Administration were, and I quote:

Taking orders from somebody and that what they are doing is only part of a plot to change our Government into communism, socialism, or some other foreign "ism," which means a dictatorship and regimentation of our people and abolishing our private system of enterprise.

The Senator did not understate the case. Not only are responsible Administration officials destroying the poultry industry; they are still limiting the acreage which the farmer may plant to produce necessary food crops.

By arbitrary and unreasonable restrictions, the Administration is strangling

the packing and the canning industries. Last week, the packers of the Nation asked Chairman Vinson of the Economic Stabilization Board to secure a ruling which would permit them to pay their employees an additional 15 cents an hour to prevent those employees seeking employment in nearby industries engaged in war production, where the wages are, in effect, paid by the Government and are much higher.

They also ask that the O. P. A., without further delay, fix a ceiling price for the finished product of the canner, which would include all costs of production. The canners were not insisting upon a price which would insure them a profit. They are asking, however, that they be permitted to operate on a basis which would enable them to exist, for, if they were forced out of business, the already apparent shortage of food would be increased.

Not long ago, McNutt's War Manpower Commission issued an order containing an unprecedented provision requiring that labor unions be consulted on the hiring and firing of workers and the obtaining of exemptions.

When a union, which merely represents employees, who are neither stockholders in, nor charged with the responsibility of the management of, a corporation, must be consulted before men can be hired or fired, it is rank hypocrisy to talk about individual enterprise or the preservation of the ability of those on the home front to adequately support the fighting forces.

The confusion and the interference with industries, with business, with farming, has grown so great that no longer can it be charged to incompetency alone. As stated by Senator O'DANIEL, there appears to be a deliberate effort on the part of administrative officials to adopt, follow, and insist upon a course of action which common sense teaches us can only end in disaster.

No fighting force can win a war unless it is adequately supported on the home front. Support on that front means production of food, processing and transporting food, producing and processing and transporting of all the things needed by an armed force must be prompt and adequate. Notwithstanding that acknowledged fact, here at home the Administration continues to interfere with all three. Exasperation exists throughout the country and the conclusion of all too many was concisely expressed on June 7, before the House Small Business Committee when W. H. Albers, president, Supermarket Institute of Cincinnati, testifying, said, "Let the policy of the organization be based on facts and let the O. P. A. stick to that policy. The agency now has become so hopelessly disorganized that the time has arrived for mobs to descend on Washington." Mere words do not bring relief.

On the following day, the President, addressing the delegates to the United States Food Conference, reading from his prepared address, said:

The better use of natural and human resources must be assured to improve living standards—

And he intimated, as he frequently has, that those improved living standards must exist throughout the world. He then added this extemporaneous statement—

And I want to add that all this will be accomplished without the exploitation of any people by any nation anywhere.

Unfortunately, what the President says is all too often followed by action which contradicts the import of his words. While the President is announcing that no individual anywhere is to be exploited; while the Senators and the Congressmen from the East are insisting upon more gasoline in order that their constituents may continue to contribute to the war effort, labor goons and labor racketeers operating under the protection of this Administration are exploiting people in the city of Port Huron, Mich., and they are defying the right of individuals to aid in the war effort.

From a courageous editor of that city comes a wire, which reads in part as follows:

Attorneys for the retail grocers here have applied to the circuit court for a temporary injunction restraining the teamsters' union, Morris Coleman, and certain other union officers from picketing, boycotting, and interfering with the grocery business by cutting off delivery of food, meat, and other items. The petition for the injunction sets forth that these acts by the teamsters' union are damaging the public health and welfare of the city of Port Huron. The court this morning granted a temporary injunction, following along the line requested, and an order to show cause on a permanent injunction, setting the hearing for next Monday morning.

Again in Port Huron there is a milk strike on. You may recall that some time ago from the well of the House your attention was called to the fact that men convicted of criminal offense, but hiding behind labor unions, were driving automobiles on rationed gasoline and rationed tires from the city of Detroit to the city of Port Huron, where they followed the conveyances driven by non-union men used to deliver milk to customers about the streets of that city and interfered with their customers in an effort to compel the nonunion drivers to stand and deliver a portion of their wages to the union racketeers. There was an investigation, but the unlawful activities of these so-called union racketeers have been renewed, according to another wire, which reads as follows:

Labor "goons" again at work in Port Huron. No action from War Labor Board. Food shortage threatened here as result of teamsters' boycott on grocery stores handling milk supplies of blacklisted dairies. Situation serious for our community. Can't you help us stop these outlaws?

When there is, throughout the East, a shortage of gasoline; when, under our Constitution, men have the right to join or not to join a union; when, under that same Constitution, protection of property is guaranteed; when we are spending billions upon billions of dollars and sacrificing the lives of thousands of men to carry freedom from want and freedom from fear to all the peoples of the world, why should this administration extend protection or fail to prosecute those who,

here in America—to be specific, in Michigan, in Port Huron—are being exploited by the political allies of this administration? What excuse is there for permitting the use of rationed tires and rationed gasoline by those who are insisting that loyalty to the union is more important than loyalty to the Government?

The President of the United States, who is so fond of calling himself Commander in Chief, has ordered our civilians to work and produce. Now comes the union organizers, who add a proviso to that order, which is that citizens shall work and produce when, and only when, they become members of a union.

If the President expects the respect, the wholehearted support of the civilian population, he must play fair; he must treat with justice those who have obeyed his order.

Not long ago the President appealed to the coal miners to return to work. Fifteen Peoria, Ill., coal miners went back to work on May 3, in answer to the President's demand. On June 4, those 15 miners were called upon by their local union to face the union's executive board and to answer for their disobedience to the union's order to strike.

As was asked from the well of the House on March 22, Who is the big boss? In time of war the President called upon those miners to dig coal. They dug coal, and now they are being prosecuted by their union for obeying the President's order, for refusing to obey the strike order of the union.

Are the people of Port Huron to be protected? Are those who in Port Huron and surrounding territory are producing milk to be protected in their efforts to deliver that milk? Are grocery stores engaged in distributing food to have their supplies of food cut off, food which comes in through interstate commerce, by striking teamsters of the A. F. of L.?

As Mr. Albers suggested to the Small Business Committee, if this administration does not straighten out the lawlessness which it is protecting by its refusal to act, there will be the formation and the unlawful activities of mobs.

Am I preaching violence? No, not by any means, for I abhor violence. I am merely anticipating the natural result of exploitation, extortion, racketeering, and violence.

Already in Los Angeles, the zoot-suit-wearing violators of the law, the insulters of soldiers and sailors and of their sweethearts, have learned what the anger of those in the armed forces means. We have had violence. Strange as it may seem, the military authorities have declared Los Angeles closed to the members of the armed forces. The obvious, the just, reaction to the practices of zoot-suiters would have been to punish them for their unlawfulness. Had a firm, just procedure been adopted in the beginning there would have been no need to bar Los Angeles to the armed services. Apparently we, in this country, must make a choice between lawless violence, unjustifiable assaults upon the constitutional rights of our citizens, and orderly constitutional processes.

The racketeers should be barred from Port Huron, Mich., and the zoot-suiters

should be kicked into the jails of Los Angeles. Their constitutional rights should be restored to the people of Port Huron, and the soldiers, sailors, and marines—all those in the armed forces of Uncle Sam—should be allowed into the city of Los Angeles. Those who are going to sacrifice their lives in behalf of their country should not be barred from the streets of any American city. When the fighting men come home those who seek to deprive them and their relatives of the American way of life will meet a just, a swift, and effective retribution.

Unless this administration begins to preserve some of the "four freedoms" here in America, some fighting men may think it their right to do something before they go to preserve the American way while they are gone.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow after the disposition of the business on the Speaker's table and other special orders I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, can the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], the majority leader, inform us of the program for tomorrow and the early part of next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. On tomorrow we plan to take up the conference report on the labor bill, the strike legislation.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And that is all that is scheduled for tomorrow?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

On Monday of next week three bills reported out of the Committee on Immigration will be taken up. If any of those bills do not go through on Monday they will not be carried over to Tuesday. Monday has been set aside for the consideration of those three reports.

On Tuesday of next week individual bills on the Private Calendar will be called. I understand there are between 80 and 90 bills and I think there should be a call of the Private Calendar.

On Tuesday the Labor-Social Security bill will be called up and after disposition of that bill the War Agency appropriation bill will be called and then the War Department appropriation bill.

There is also a lend-lease conference report which I understand will be

brought up in a few minutes. I understand there is a complete agreement on that.

If that is disposed of now there is a conference report on the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill still pending.

I am unable to give any information as to what day that will come up, but I will advise the gentleman.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman has given us what we need for the next day or two and I thank him.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Record.)

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS TO CARRY OUT PROVISIONS OF AN ACT TO PROMOTE THE DEFENSE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. CANNON of Missouri submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 2753) making supplemental appropriations to carry out the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2753) "making supplemental appropriations to carry out the provisions of an Act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2 and 3.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: "Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment and at the end of the matter so restored insert 'produced in the continental United States'; and the Senate agree to the same.

CLARENCE CANNON,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
EMMETT O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,

Managers on the part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
GERALD P. NYE,
H. C. LODGE, Jr.,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2753) making supplemental appropriations to carry out the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

No. 1: The House bill contains a provision that none of the funds appropriated therein shall be used for the payment of any subsidy on agricultural products. This matter is

stricken out by the Senate. The conference agreement restores the House language and limits the provision to such products produced in the continental United States.

No. 2: Section 3, inserted by the Senate, amends the act of March 25, 1943 (Public Law 18) by increasing from 225,000,000 to 275,000,000 bushels the amount of wheat in governmental control that may be sold for feed purposes. The substance of this section has been incorporated in House Joint Resolution 133 which passed the House of Representatives on June 4 and the Senate on June 8. The conference agreement eliminates the Senate amendment.

No. 3: Corrects a section number in the bill to conform to conference action.

CLARENCE CANNON,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
EMMETT O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill (H. R. 2753) making supplemental appropriations to carry out the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, this conference report is a unanimous report of the managers on the part of the House. There were only three amendments in disagreement.

The Senate struck out the House provision prohibiting the use of any of the money in the bill for the payment of subsidies on agricultural products. The conferees have restored the House language and modified it so that it applies only to agricultural commodities produced in continental United States.

The Senate also added an amendment increasing from 225,000,000 bushels to 275,000,000 bushels the amount of Government wheat that may be sold for feed purposes and the Senate has receded from that amendment. The Senate receded also on the third amendment which was really a technical amendment affecting a section number.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I see no reason why the House should not immediately agree to this report and send the bill back to the Senate for final action.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman from New York. The amendments involved relate to matters on which the House has repeatedly expressed itself and the agreement with the managers on the part of the Senate is in accord with the House position. I might say by way of explanation that the amendment relating to wheat was eliminated because the House on June 4 and the Senate on June

8 passed House Joint Resolution No. 133, which accomplishes the same purpose as that proposed by the Senate amendment. It has now gone to the President.

It covers the exact proposition and puts into effect all that the Senate amendment would have accomplished. For that reason the Senate receded.

Mr. TABER. Otherwise we would have been willing to yield to the Senate amendment?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We would have yielded but for the fact that the legislation covering the same proposition previously passed obviated any need for further legislation on the subject.

Mr. TABER. Because it is necessary to have this wheat for feed at the present time.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Under the legislation already enacted 50,000,000 bushels more of Government wheat may be sold for feed purposes. The conferees of both Houses were in complete concurrence on the need for additional feed in order to provide for maximum food production.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have received a petition from various organizations of the city of Washington interested in a proposed constitutional amendment giving to the citizens of the city of Washington the right to participate in the election of Presidential electors and to have such representation in the two Houses of Congress as the Congress may agree to. This petition is made by many organizations in Washington, headed by the Citizens' Joint Committee on National Representation for the District of Columbia, of which the grand old man of Washington and America, Theodore W. Noyes, is chairman.

I see no good objection to this proposed constitutional amendment from any angle. To the people who feel that the Federal Government should never surrender the power to govern the District of Columbia this proposed amendment should not be objectionable, because there is no surrender of that power proposed. If the amendment should be adopted and Congress should act under the grant of power conferred, Congress would retain the power to modify or even repeal the whole thing if the governmental arrangement inaugurated should not work. This proposed amendment will be merely an enabling provision granting power to the Congress to give to the American citizens living in the District of Columbia such rights to participate in the National Government as in the judgment of the Congress would not interfere with the Federal interest.

I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein this resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS]?

There was no objection.

The petition referred to follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

Your petitioners, the Citizens' Joint Committee on National Representation for the District of Columbia, and the Presidents of its Constituent and Cooperating Organizations, whose names are subscribed below, hereby reaffirm the principles proclaimed by the founders of our Republic that "Taxation without representation is tyranny"; that "Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed"; and in order that "Government of the people, by the people and for the people" may become an accomplished fact for all the people of the United States, respectfully represent:

That the over one-half million totally disfranchised and unrepresented citizens of the United States resident in the District of Columbia, obey national laws, outnumber the residents of each of 12 States and pay more national taxes than each of 22 of the States.

That over two decades ago, when they outnumbered only six States, they supplied to the Army and Navy of the United States, a larger number of men than any one of seven of the States, and oversubscribed their quotas of all wartime funds.

That again in the present war for the preservation of the principles of democracy and civilization as against despotism and barbarism thousands of these voteless and unrepresented Americans of the District of Columbia are now by voluntary enrollment and by draft serving in the armed forces of our country.

That these, your fellow Americans, now have no voice in their national Government which requires them to fight, to bleed and, perhaps, to die.

That as a fundamental right they are as justly entitled, as are other Americans, to voting representation in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President.

That the only sound reason which can be offered for any departure, in the case of the District of Columbia, from the fundamental American concepts of representative government is for protection of the national interest in the Nation's seat of government and then only to the extent required for such effective protection.

That this protection of the national interest—coupled with recognition of the interest and rights of the people of the District—is provided in our proposed constitutional amendment which confirms in Congress continuing control of District representation so that both the Nation's and the District's interests may always be equitably protected.

We, therefore, respectfully petition the adoption of House Joint Resolution 81 and the identical Senate Joint Resolution 33, which propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States empowering Congress to grant the above sought relief to the citizens of the United States resident in the District of Columbia.

THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT

"The Congress shall have power to provide that there shall be in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President members elected by the people of the District constituting the seat of government of the United States, in such numbers and with such powers as the Congress shall

determine. All legislation hereunder shall be subject to amendment and repeal."

Theodore W. Noyes, Chairman, Citizens' Joint Committee on District of Columbia National Representation; Granville Gude, President, Board of Trade; Harry S. Wender, President, Federation of Citizens' Association (66 member groups); John Locher, President, Central Labor Union (150 local unions); Mrs. Arthur C. Watkins, President, Federation of Women's Clubs (31 Clubs); Mrs. Eugene Callaghan, President, Voteless D. C. League of Women Voters; J. G. Bell, President, Merchants' and Manufacturers' Association; W. H. Blanz, President, District of Columbia Building and Loan League; Paul B. Cromelin, President, Bar Association; Helen Goodner, President, Women's Bar Association; Wm. J. Mileham, President, Federation of Business Men's Associations (21 associations); Robert J. Buxbaum, President, Maryland State and District of Columbia Federation of Labor (250 local unions); Dr. Victor Meyers, Chairman, Inter-Federation Conference; Theodore W. Noyes, President, Association of Oldest Inhabitants; Evan H. Tucker, President, Northeast Washington Citizens' Association; Claud Livingston, President, Washington Real Estate Board; Louis D. Krawow, President, Advertising Club of Washington; Dorothy E. Marvin, President Twentieth Century Club; Martha A. Swift, Acting President, Women's City Club; Charles H. Bates, President, Society of Natives of the District of Columbia; Harald H. Lund, President, Monday Evening Club; Lillian Detre, President, Washington Section, National Council of Jewish Women; Julian Brylawski, President, Motion Picture Theater Owners of the District of Columbia; Preston W. Grant, President, Junior Board of Commerce; Samuel E. Collegeman, President, Associated Retail Credit Men of Washington, D. C.; Mrs. J. Dan Blackstone, President, Florists' Club of Washington; L. G. Jackson, President, Hotel Greeters of America, Charter 31; Thomas M. Hysong, President, Newcomers Club; Mildred C. Clum, President, Soroptimist Club; Etta L. Taggart, President, The Washingtonians; Kathryn S. Mitchell, Chairman, Legislative Committee, American Association of University Women; Richard A. Burton, Department Commander, Dept. of D. C. Veterans of Foreign Wars (15 posts); Patrick J. Fitzgibbons, Department Commander, Dept. of D. C. American Legion (40 posts); Joseph M. Cohan, President, D. C. Chapter Rainbow Division of Veterans; Charles A. Murray, President, Young Democratic Clubs of District of Columbia; Malcolm S. McConihe, Democratic National Committeeman for the District of Columbia; E. F. Colladay, Republican National Committeeman for the District of Columbia; Mabel H. Ellett, President, District of Columbia Congress of Parent-Teacher Associations (71 associations); Wilbur S. Finch, President, District of Columbia Suffrage Association.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the gasoline problem.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]?

There was no objection.

PREVIOUS ORDERS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, in asking for 30 minutes I did so because I understand that some of my friends in the House, particularly those from California have contrary opinions upon the subject which I shall address myself to, and in order to be fair I thought if I would impose myself upon them for 15 minutes I ought to be willing to have them impose their thoughts and questions upon me for 15 minutes. For that reason I do not propose to yield for the first 15 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Congress I am ashamed of the treatment we have accorded China over the years. I am especially ashamed of the fact that, although friendly to China, yet we furnished Japan a large part of the war materials she needed to carry on her aggressive war against China and to build up her war fleet to make war upon us. If we had placed an embargo upon the sale of war materials to Japan, as some of us advocated several years ago, she would have been unable to take over Manchuria, and certainly she would have been unable to prepare to make war upon us.

Mr. Speaker, today we have the opportunity to bring about a better understanding between the Chinese people and ourselves and to do justice to the Nation that is our most friendly ally in the present war. This opportunity presents itself in the proposal to repeal the Chinese Exclusion Act, which is now being considered by the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

In considering a bill to repeal the Chinese Exclusion Act, as in the consideration of all other legislation that affects the welfare of this Nation, we should keep before us first, last, and all the time the question, What effect will this legislation have upon the general welfare of our people? On that point there can be no difference of opinion and no argument.

Therefore, keeping the interests of this Nation before me as the primary objective, I want to consider the effect of the passage of this bill from two different angles:

First. What will be the effect of its passage upon the war effort? Will it help or hinder the same?

Second. What will be the effect of its passage upon the post-war period? Will it aid or hinder us in providing jobs for our returning soldiers? Will it help us to preserve our American standard of living after the war is over?

I confess at the outset that in limiting myself to these two points of view, I am

being entirely selfish and practical. I am deliberately ignoring the ethical questions involved and the moral justness of the measure. I am also excluding all sentimental arguments that might be made for lifting a stigma we placed upon a great people 60 years ago, the only people that can preserve peace in Asia in the years to come, and help us keep Japan in her place.

Taking up my first question, "Will the passage of this bill aid our war effort, and help bring the war to a speedy and successful end?" Mr. Speaker, I am not a military expert nor a military authority, therefore in finding the answer to this question I must depend upon those who can qualify in those respects. Our military experts tell us that because of transportation difficulties we cannot today send China much material aid in the shape of guns, tanks, planes, food, and so forth; aid that she needs so badly in order to carry on her heroic resistance against the Japanese aggressor. These military experts tell us we must first recapture the port of Rangoon, now in Japanese hands, and reopen the Burma Road before we can send China the aid she needs so badly. Chinese military experts tell us that the repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act will do much to stiffen up the morale of the Chinese people and to help offset Japanese propaganda against the United States concerning our treatment of the Chinese people over the years. Our State Department very wisely removed one of the long-standing obstacles to good will between China and the United States when it voluntarily gave up our so-called extraterritorial rights in China. Now Congress has the opportunity to remove the other long-standing obstacle to good will and full friendship between the two nations by repealing the Chinese Exclusion Act, thereby placing China—as far as immigration is concerned—upon the same basis as other nations that have been given a quota.

Mr. Speaker, Admiral Yarnell, an authority on the war situation in the Far East, considers the repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act as a very necessary and vital part of our war effort. He testified before our Committee on Immigration and Naturalization as follows:

Japan has utilized American exclusion laws with much effect in her propaganda campaign in China and other areas of the Far East. By the repeal of these laws this means of stirring up hatred of the western nations will be eliminated. In the consideration of the repeal of these laws, we also should look beyond the war to the peace settlement and the years to follow. . . . In order to insure peace in the Far East, there must be a strong, stable, and democratic government in China. . . . It is my conviction that the repeal of these laws will have far-reaching effects as a war and as a post-war measure. It will also be a partial recognition of the bravery and endurance of a great people who for 6 years have been fighting America's most dangerous enemy. . . . China has a tremendous army available of excellent soldier material and all they need are munitions, leadership, and training. If we can keep China in the war, there is no necessity, as far as I can see, of sending a single American soldier to China outside of technicians and

advisers and people who can help them organize and train their Army.

Constantine Brown, one of our best commentators on the war and war strategy, sums up the situation in China as follows:

The campaign (in Burma) must wait until the monsoon season is over. And the question of whether the Chinese will be able to hold out until next October, when offensive operations in that area can be resumed, becomes increasingly important. China's special Ambassador to Washington, T. V. Soong, has not been pulling his punches recently and his warnings that China might be forced out of the war before the end of the year have not been taken as bluff and empty threats. . . . Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek sought to minimize the importance of the desertion of so many of his generals who went over to the enemy bag and baggage. His pride apparently induced him to suppress or discount the importance of these desertions. . . . The fiasco of the campaign against the Japanese in Burma, coupled with a renewed and powerful offensive of the Japs against Chungking, has brought the situation to a head. We are now being bluntly told that unless something decisive occurs China may be completely in the hands of the Japanese before the end of the year. Dr. Soong is said to believe that Chiang's forces may be able to hold on until the end of the monsoon rains and that if the Allies keep their pledge to start an offensive in Burma when the dry season begins, Chiang may stay in the war. This point of view is not shared by some of our war strategists. . . . According to information reaching Washington from China, the Japanese appear determined to end China's resistance before the Allies have an opportunity to make a serious drive against Burma next fall. And on the basis of what we know of China's war material and modern fighting equipment, some military men express serious doubts whether Chiang will be able to resist a determined Japanese drive this summer.

And so, Mr. Speaker, judging from the testimony of these expert witnesses, the answer to my question, Will the passage of this bill aid our war effort and help bring the war to a speedy and successful conclusion? is an emphatic "Yes."

II

Mr. Speaker, I now come to my second question, What will be the effect of the repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act upon the post-war period? Will it aid or hinder us in providing jobs for our returning soldiers? Will it help us preserve our American standard of living after the war is over?

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Dewey], perhaps the best informed man in the House on international finance, international credits, and international trade, testified before our committee on the possibilities for American commerce in the post-war period. His testimony was complete, convincing, and irrefutable. In substance he stated that China, with her 450,000,000 people, now on the verge of a great industrial awakening, offers the only real post-war market for American manufactured goods. He also stated that China will need billions of dollars worth of American products and that she can pay for these goods because she has vast amounts of raw products that we need, and so can establish the international credits that go with a favorable balance

of trade. On the other hand, Congressman Dewey pointed out that while Europe after the war will need vast amounts of American products of all kinds, Europe will have nothing to pay for them, neither raw products, nor cash, which means, of course, a repetition of what happened in our trade relations with Europe after the last war. Congressman Dewey left no doubt in my mind that the answer to this second question, or series of questions, is as emphatic an affirmative as the answer we gave to the first question.

Mr. Speaker, I want to offer one or two observations of my own at this point in support of the convincing testimony given by my colleague from Illinois. Senator Beveridge, of Indiana, one of the greatest statesmen we have ever produced in America, stated in a speech made decades ago:

Our trade henceforth must be with Asia. The Pacific is one ocean, and the Pacific is the ocean of the commerce of the future. Most future wars will be conflicts for commerce. The power that rules the Pacific therefore will be the power that rules the world.

My only comment upon this quotation from Beveridge is that with close friendly cooperative ties between Uncle Sam and the awakening giant of the Orient, China, there will arise no question as to what joint powers will rule the Pacific hereafter.

I now want to present another viewpoint on the vital effect the passage of this bill will have on post-war trade, a viewpoint given me at first hand by the leaders of the machine-tools industry of Rockford, Ill., the greatest center of machine-tools production in the United States.

The machine-tools industry of America, in its effort to support and sustain the Nation's war aims, produced during the past 2 years \$2,200,000,000 worth of machine tools, the equivalent of its total output for 20 years preceding Pearl Harbor. Even though we assume that the Nation will be on a sustained level of prosperity higher than ever before, these permanent additions to the Nation's production tools are more than adequate to meet the demands of our economy for 20 years to come.

During World War No. 1 we piled up so great a supply of machine tools, compared to normal needs, that one-third of the companies building machine tools for the First World War were forced out of business; some went bankrupt, some sold out their assets, and some merged with other companies in the struggle for survival that was forced upon the industry in the adjustment period of the "difficult twenties."

Taking only machines 13 years old as a basis for determining the supply of efficient machines remaining after the war, the United States will have on hand a volume of modern machine tools at the end of 1943 that cost over \$4,000,000,000, of which three-fourths will have been built in the last 3 years. It will require but few new or special machines to supplement this vast amount of potential metal-working capacity to produce all

the goods and services the whole world can consume over many years to come.

In view of these facts, unless we find some way to dispose of the surplus machine tools left on our hands at the close of the war, at a profit, we will either have to dump them in the ocean or the thousands of former workers in the machine-tools industry now in uniform will find themselves out of a job when they come back because the plants in which they formerly worked will be closed. What is true of the machine-tools industry is true of many other manufacturing industries of America. This is a post-war situation that must be faced.

Mr. Speaker, China is awakening from her long sleep. She is on the verge of an industrial revolution. She will need billions of dollars worth of machine tools after this war is over to help in her industrial development. She will need railroads built; railroad engines and railroad equipment for those railroads; farm machinery for modernizing her agricultural methods; road-building machinery to build the vast system of hard roads that will be required; and mining machinery to develop her vast mineral resources. Best of all China will have the raw materials and consequent international credits to pay for these things. And so, Mr. Speaker, our potential trade with China after this war is over should furnish jobs to hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of our boys when they return from the war.

During the hearings on the proposal to repeal the Chinese Exclusion Act the testimony showed that the act was passed in 1882 to prevent a flood of cheap labor that threatened at that time. Since then we have passed laws that restrict immigration by placing all European countries on a quota basis. Under a quota only 107 Chinese people could enter this country each year. Therefore, if the Chinese exclusion laws were repealed and China were placed upon a quota basis like other nations, at the rate of 107 Chinese immigrants per year, cheap labor from China, the problem of the 1880's, could never become a problem in the future.

Looking at the question before us, the proposal to repeal the Chinese Exclusion Act, and keeping in mind the best interests of our people as our primary objective, I say we should repeal the act, and thereby place China, our ally and friend, upon an equal footing with other nations that have been placed upon a quota basis. This, in my judgment, is the least we can do at this time to rectify our past mistakes in dealing with China, and to do justice to our most friendly ally in the present war.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. If China is allowed a quota of 107, and I believe the number is 105—it has been refigured—will those people have to pass the ordinary tests as to health, literacy, and financial responsibility to enter this country?

Mr. MASON. They would all have to pass the same tests that other quota people from all nations have to pass now.

Mr. CURTIS. Is it or is it not true that the Chinese have been coming to the United States every year, lawfully, under various laws relating to wives of certain citizens, students, merchants, and other classifications, in the absence of a quota?

Mr. MASON. That is true.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman referred to the people in the State of California earlier in his address. May I preface my remarks by stating that the people of California—and I believe that can be said also for Oregon and Washington—thoroughly appreciate the magnificent struggle the Chinese have been putting up against our common enemy. I think every Member of this House admires Mme. Chiang Kai-shek, whom, incidentally, I had the honor of meeting when she was known as Miss Soong Mei-Ling, many years ago. We have many friends among the Chinese people.

We recognize the problem, however, as the gentleman has aptly referred to it, as being an economic problem. Of course, the entry of 100 or 105 Chinese people, even if they were coolies, would not amount to a great deal as far as creating an economic problem in our Pacific States is concerned.

It must also be recognized that the problem presented is presented to the three Western States in very large measure, because these people seldom get beyond the Pacific coast. When they arrive there they find a salubrious climate, and they like to stay, just as do others.

The gentleman's committee proposes to admit 105 Chinese per annum. Without taking a position on that particular matter, I am interested to know whether the gentleman and his committee are also interested in admitting other Asiatics after this war is over in some similar volume or greater or less volume.

Mr. MASON. Speaking from the standpoint of the gentleman from Illinois, no. Speaking from the standpoint of the committee, I do not know what the viewpoint of the committee would be until that question was raised.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman recognizes that it is a very large problem?

Mr. MASON. I do.

Mr. HINSHAW. And that it has to deal with world relations as well as our own economic condition?

Mr. MASON. I think I can say, from the standpoint of the committee, that not for 500 years would this committee, as it is now composed, if it lasted that long, be willing to permit one Jap to enter.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman recognizes that there were 16,000 Japanese in the United States at the time of the Oriental Exclusion Act, and that through processes of their own that number has been multiplied to something between 125,000 and 130,000 at this time.

Mr. MASON. They were not all legitimate processes, because a great many of them have sneaked in.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman knows that the Immigration Service on our

border is engaged very largely in protecting the United States from an influx of a great flood of orientals who would come in here and offer their services far below the prices that our own labor should have.

Mr. MASON. I agree with that, but this bill, restricting the immigration to 105 or 107, absolutely shuts out any danger of that possibility.

Mr. HINSHAW. I should like to ask the gentleman one more question. This is in all sincerity. I have due regard for the industries in the gentleman's district. It has been complained of heretofore that certain countries have been implemented in the production of devices for the destruction of others through our having shipped certain machinery, supplies, scrap iron, and so forth, in times gone by, and that with those materials they have built up a very considerable war industry.

Of course, we do not expect that the Chinese people, if we implement them with the machinery so well made in the gentleman's district and other parts of the United States, would be setting up a similar war machine against us, but the gentleman does recognize that competition from the peacetime products of those machines under the low wage scales existing in Asia might form a very serious menace to our foreign trade.

Mr. MASON. That is true, and that is a problem that will have to be met, whether we sell it to them or somebody else does, some 50 years from now, by perhaps tariff bars.

Mr. HINSHAW. Everyone must recognize that China has sufficient absorbing power for a great deal of goods, so that she could probably produce things for herself, and herself exclusively, for a long time to come, but the gentleman does recognize that the very low wage scales and low living conditions that exist throughout Asia form a serious competitive condition to other countries with high scales of living.

Mr. MASON. I do.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I hope the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] is not under a misapprehension, because I am the author of one of the bills to allow the Chinese to come in.

Mr. HINSHAW. Oh, the gentleman is assured that I have made no comment concerning a bill. I am simply speculating on other matters.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I may say to the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from California, that as for the 16,000 Japs that originally came in and that now through natural processes and smuggling, have grown to 130,000 or 140,000, I wish they might have been 140,000 Chinese that we had let come in in that way. May I ask the gentleman from Illinois this question? The gentleman knows, because he has been on the committee for many years, after all, speaking of the number of Chinese, that there are probably smuggled into this country 10 times the number proposed to allow in every year, but they would not be of as

high class of people as would come in under the quota.

Mr. MASON. That is true.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. Yes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. We had hearings for 3 months, and is it not true that the abundance of evidence from the best brains of the country was that in order to save the killing of thousands of our young men in this war, that could be done by removing this restriction, and the evidence was also that China can handle herself in her own way, if we will only put them on an equal basis, and she even went so far as to say that she does not care whether you allow 107 or 7, as long as you remove the restriction and give her recognition, so that she may stop the propaganda of Japan which is going on every day.

Mr. MASON. Yes, and the summary of testimony would go to show, the testimony of Admiral Yarnell and others, that they need not an American boy, but it will keep her on her feet until she can get herself prepared.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Can the gentleman see any ground for the American Federation of Labor, or even for the American Legion, trying to throw water on this proposition from an economic standpoint?

Mr. MASON. As I brought out as they were testifying, they were testifying from their old historic standpoint, from the standpoint of lowering the price of labor, something that this bill would prevent.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Is it not true that in the committee consideration we have closed every loophole, and that only 107 would come in?

Mr. MASON. That is correct.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. Yes.

Mr. JUDD. To make this observation with regard to the question raised of potential economic threats by the Chinese as they become industrialized. I think we are together on the diagnosis, but the question is how to treat the matter. The history of mankind is that men who are free try to use their goods for themselves and to raise their standards of living, but that men who are controlled from the outside are kept on low standards, so that those who control them may use them from an economic basis to produce goods more cheaply.

Take Turkey, practically the only nation over there that came out of the war free. Look at Turkey's standard of living and see what it has done. She cannot undercut us now. England keeps India down. The Chinese will be kept down by the Japanese, if they should win, to a position of slave labor. We could not compete with that. The answer to it is to help China hold true and become free, and then by the time the 50 years is up she will more or less have developed her own industry and her standard of living would become sufficiently high that there would not be anywhere near as great a gap.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for another 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Should we fail to keep China in the war against Japan, and China should capitulate and join Japan, then will there be any of the Asiatic people on our side?

Mr. MASON. No. The testimony shows that if that should happen, our war with Japan would be lengthened at least 5 or 10 years, if not longer.

Mr. CURTIS. And it would become a race war. Is that not right?

Mr. MASON. It would.

Mr. CURTIS. What does the gentleman have to say with reference to the outlook not only for the present generation but for our children and our grandchildren should this war become a race war and we not have a staunch ally in Asia, so that men of ideals can stand together rather than men of color?

Mr. MASON. I shudder to think about what could happen under those conditions.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman is the ranking member on the Committee on Immigration and he is acquainted with every member of the committee. While we differ as to many bills, what is the gentleman's opinion as to the majority of that committee on the general question of immigration? Does the gentleman feel there is a movement on foot to raise all bars and add to the immigration in this country?

Mr. MASON. I do not think there is any danger of that whatever. I think at least a majority of the committee as it is now constituted would be rather in favor of lowering the quotas than increasing the quotas. I am sure that is true today as the committee is now constituted.

Mr. CURTIS. As the law now stands there is a quota for Hitler but not for Mme. Chiang Kai-shek?

Mr. MASON. That is right.

Mr. HINSHAW. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MASON. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd] has aptly stated a truth to which we will all agree, I think, without any question. The gentleman has further stated part of it in his previous remarks. I believe that the Congress, in considering all of this matter, should have a principle before it. That principle should be that while we hope to raise the standards of the rest of the world to equal our own, we will take such a position on all matters that will not allow our own standards to be reduced in the process.

Mr. MASON. I will say "amen" to that.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is one of the vital things that we must consider. That is the reason why the American Federation of Labor and the American Legion and other organizations are very fearful of this act, that there will be

something involved here as a precedent or otherwise that would ultimately reduce the standard of living, through such competition.

Mr. MASON. I will say to the gentleman they are not fearful of this act, because they have not studied this act, and they do not know what is in this act.

Mr. HINSHAW. They are fearful of the principle involved in this act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time may be extended 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MASON. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I appreciate what the gentleman from California is saying, but is this not true: Does England have any exclusion against the Chinese?

Mr. MASON. They do not.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course, if we do not sell the Chinese the things that they need to build themselves up, will not England and Russia sell her those things?

Mr. MASON. That is a self-evident fact.

Mr. HINSHAW. I was merely speaking of a general principle as to our own country.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course, they will sell to China. They are entitled to sell to the Chinese, but after this war, let the group who oppose this question from an economic standpoint understand that if we keep our exclusion acts on the books after the war and China does recover, of course she will buy from England and Russia and the other countries who say to her, "You are equal with us."

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentlemen should all understand that I may vote for this bill. I have not had an opportunity to give it the study that the gentlemen on the committee have given it, but nevertheless there are some principles which we must consider.

Mr. MASON. I want to interject this—that is, that my one regret is that those who were supposed to be contrary-minded to myself on the issue in the bill are not here to enliven the argument. We are too much agreed.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MASON. I yield.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. There were hundreds of witnesses and petitions representing over 80,000,000 people who came before the committee; churches of all religious denominations, civic and religious groups, have appealed for the repeal of the Chinese exclusion law, and there was not one answer against that. And those who have been opposing it have been opposing it either from the standpoint of politics or in spite of the fact that a war is on and our boys are going to pay for it unless we do what the committee is trying to do now.

Mr. MASON. I personally invited at least half a dozen of those of contrary mind to stay and take part in this discussion.

Mr. HINSHAW. Is that the reason the gentleman did not personally invite me here?

Mr. MASON. No.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, June 16, at the conclusion of the legislative program and other previous orders heretofore granted, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 5 minutes and revise and extend my remarks and include therewith certain excerpts from letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, there has been a growing question among our citizens at home concerning what is going to happen to them in the way of medical care if their doctors, dentists, and so forth are all or most of them removed from our midst. I have had occasion recently to learn what happens to a doctor when he comes under the purview of the Procurement and Assignment Service Office. It seems to me this service acts in a nonofficial status and in an advisory capacity in connection with the Federal Security Agency, and also with the Army and Navy. You will be interested in this letter, I am sure, which comes from the Procurement and Assignment Service in a stamped envelope, unofficial, and which I received from a physician in Los Angeles. It states:

On February —, 1943, you were mailed a blank military classification card with the statement that "The War Manpower Commission in Washington was making a definite request that this card be filled out by every licensed medical physician not in service, regardless of age or physical condition, or other interests."

This is not an attempt to force anyone into the service, but it is important that our records in this respect be completed. We are under obligation to our Washington office to complete this record, and you are under obligation to do your part by filling out and returning this card at once.

That is signed by the chairman of the Los Angeles County committee. The card enclosed has a blank to be filled stating which of several branches of the armed services the doctor prefers to serve in.

You might also be interested to know what happens to people like him, and no doubt there are a great many doctors who find themselves in the position where it would be very difficult to meet the call, in addition to the fact that they have families, probably, and who do not answer that letter.

In the event that letter is not answered, another letter is received. While this is supposed to come from the Procurement and Assignment Service,

nevertheless the envelope in which the letter was mailed was a penalty envelope and marked on the penalty envelope it says:

Federal Security Agency, Social Security Board.

On the letterhead of the Procurement and Assignment Service we find this letter:

DEAR DOCTOR: Our records show that you were sent a letter from the central office, Procurement and Assignment Service, Washington, D. C., 2 or more weeks ago, requesting you to send to this office an enclosed card expressing your preference—

Get that—

expressing your preference for military service—Army, Air, or Navy.

You will note they asked him to express his preference for which branch of the service he wants to enter; they are not merely asking him to go into the service; they are asking him the branch of service he prefers to serve in. It further states:

On April —, 1943, we wrote you that we had not received this card and asked you to send it in, or please communicate with this office, indicating your preference for service. We have had no reply.

Paragraph 8 of a directive to this office from the War Manpower Commission, Washington, D. C., dated February 15, reads as follows:

"In all cases of available individuals who refused to make application for commission, the names should be referred to the State director of selective service as nonessential unless they are needed for relocation."

It is with reference to that situation the doctors would like to know. First they are asked to express their preference for the branch of service they want to be in, and then when and if a doctor does not state a preference, or does not want any branch, but prefers to stay home and attend to his practice, or if he does not make an application, his name will be turned over to the State director of selective service as nonessential unless he may be needed for relocation.

What kind of business is that? Are those mothers and children who live at home to have no consideration? Are the physicians of this country to have no consideration from their Government, particularly physicians who might be badly needed to take care of the people in their own home communities? Many communities are already dangerously short of medical services.

It seems to me that somebody should take a little look into that situation and see under what authority the War Manpower Commission can state that a doctor is nonessential in the event he has not made an application for a commission in the Army, the Navy, or the air force.

The concluding paragraph of the letter states:

If we do not hear from you within 1 week from this date, this directive will have to be complied with and your name sent to the State director of selective service.

And yet in the first letter it said:

This is not an attempt to force anyone into service.

The best answer is in the vernacular, "Oh, yeah?"

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. GILLIE, for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

To Mr. HARTLEY (at the request of Mr. POWERS), for Wednesday, June 9, 1943, on account of business.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1563. An act authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain auxiliary vessels for the United States Navy, and for other purposes.

BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2664. An act to provide for the training of nurses for the armed forces, governmental and civilian hospitals, health agencies, and war industries, through grants to institutions providing such training, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 133. Joint resolution to permit additional sales of wheat for feed.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, June 11, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE CIVIL SERVICE

The Committee on the Civil Service will hold a public hearing on Friday, June 11, 1943, at 10 a. m. (H. Res. 16), for further investigation and studies of the policies and practices relating to civilian employment in governmental departments. Room 246, Old House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

The Flood Control Committee will conduct hearings on flood-control reports submitted by the Chief of Engineers since the passage of the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941, and on amendments to existing law. Flood-control projects for post-war construction will be among the most satisfactory public works, and the committee plans

an adequate backlog of sound flood-control projects available for construction following the war.

Friday, June 11: Senators and Representatives of Congress.

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be a meeting of Subcommittee No. 7 of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads on Friday, June 11, 1943, at 10 a. m., for the consideration of bills relating to the carrying of mail on star routes. Public hearings will be held.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the securities subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 a. m., Friday, June 11, 1943.

Business to be considered: Open hearing to hear Mr. Ganson Purcell, Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, on proxy rules.

There will be a meeting of the subcommittee on investigation of restrictions on brand names and newsprint of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 2 p. m., Monday, June 14, 1943.

Business to be considered: To hear representatives of Office of Price Administration. (Hearing for June 9 canceled.)

There will be a meeting of the subcommittee on investigation of restrictions on brand names and newsprint of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 2 p. m., Thursday, June 17, 1943.

Business to be considered: To hear drug witnesses. On Friday, June 18, at 2 p. m., to hear newsprint and paper witnesses.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 2620, a bill to provide for a Delegate from the District of Columbia to the House of Representatives of the United States, and for other purposes, at 10 a. m., on Wednesday, June 16, 1943, in room 346, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The subcommittee on unemployment insurance of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will consider in open hearings on Thursday, June 24, 1943, at 10 a. m., committee prints Nos. 1 and 2, dated June 7, 1943, relative to unemployment insurance for merchant seamen.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

486. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report dated October 26, 1942, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on, and a preliminary examination and survey of, the Intracoastal Waterway from Jacksonville, Fla., to Miami, Fla.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

487. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report dated October 26, 1943,

together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on the waterway from Miami to Key West, Fla.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

488. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate for the Federal Security Agency for "Grants to States for Old-Age Assistance," "Grants to States for Aid to Dependent Children," "Grants to States for Aid to the Blind," and "Grants to States for Unemployment Compensation Administration" (H. Doc. No. 234); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SPARKMAN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 693. A bill to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, approved June 16, 1942; without amendment (Rept. No. 533). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SPARKMAN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 2349. A bill to adjust the pay status of warrant officers temporarily commissioned in the Army of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 534). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. O'HARA: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 650. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of North Dakota to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Missouri River at or near Garrison, N. Dak.," approved February 10, 1932; with amendment (Rept. No. 535). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'HARA: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 2649. A bill to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Minnesota to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the village of Brooklyn Center, Minn." Public Law 525, 77th Cong.; with amendment (Rept. No. 536). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GATHINGS: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 414. An act for the relief of Thaddeus C. Knight; without amendment (Rept. No. 532). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: H. R. 2923. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, to provide for an increase of 20 percent in the amount of the Government's contribution to the dependents of enlisted men entitled to family allowances under such act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DIMOND: H. R. 2924. A bill to give effect to the provisional fur seal agreement of 1942 between the United States of America and Canada to protect the fur seals of the Pribilof

Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WHITE: H. Res. 256. Resolution authorizing an investigation by the Committee on the Public Lands of the administration of public lands; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: H. Res. 257. Resolution authorizing payment of \$250 to settle debts of Special Committee Investigating National Defense Migration; to the Committee on Accounts.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to abolish discrimination in freight rates; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. WHITE introduced a bill (H. R. 2925) for the relief of Charles J. Goff, which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1513. By Mr. ANGELL: Petition of certain citizens of Portland, Oreg., asking for the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1514. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of R. C. Garner and 60 citizens of Maplewood, Mo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1515. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. Hazledine and 17 citizens of Alma, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1516. Also, petition of Mrs. M. B. Chase and 20 citizens of Riverside, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1517. Also, petition of W. N. McIntyre and 20 citizens of Butler, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1518. Also, petition of Alma D. Patee and 81 citizens of Ridgefield, Wash., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the

manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1519. Also, petition of Catherine Marshburn and 51 citizens of Yorba Linda, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1520. Also, petition of the Men's Bible Class of the First Methodist Church of Fullerton, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1521. Also, petition of Mrs. Thomas E. Hults and 20 citizens of Sterling, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1522. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. R. E. McEnony and 22 citizens of Portland, Oreg., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1523. Also, petition of Mrs. Mollie E. Gorman and 1,009 citizens of Canton, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1524. Also, petition of Mrs. H. J. Riordan and 106 citizens of Duluth, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1525. Also, petition of Frances Enyart and 20 citizens of Burbank, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1526. Also, petition of Carl E. Carlson and 28 citizens of Minneapolis, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1527. Also, petition of Viola Perry and 28 citizens of Hannibal, Mo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the

winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1528. Also, petition of Mrs. S. A. Chilton and 107 citizens of Cheesaning, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1529. By Mr. CANFIELD: Resolution passed by the Board of Commissioners of the City of Passaic, N. J., endorsing the provisions of Senate bill 1137 and House bill 2783 in aid of post-war planning; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1530. By Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Petition of 50 citizens of the State of Iowa, urging support of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1531. By Mr. HALLECK: Petition of sundry citizens of Valparaiso, Ind., and vicinity, urging the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1532. By Mr. KEARNEY: Petition of Erskine M. Irvine and 99 other citizens of Schenectady, N. Y., appealing for the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1533. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of Mr. and Mrs. A. A. Ames and other citizens of Wheeling, W. Va., and vicinity, urging the passage of House bill 2082, the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1534. By Mr. VORYS of Ohio: Petition of Mrs. John Fisher and three other residents of Franklin County, urging the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1535. By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH: Petition of the mayor and City Council of Brockton, Mass., protesting against the granting of contracts for the manufacture of Army shoes by prison labor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JUNE 11, 1943

(Legislative day of Monday, May 24, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, we, the creatures of time and sense, with the fever of mortal days upon our spirits, with wistful longings which haunt the depths of our being, turn to Thee, the King eternal, immortal, invisible. We change with the changing days. We are fretted by every passing wind, tempest-tossed and afraid. But Thou art the same yesterday, today, and forever. Even now, as we face perplexing decisions affecting the lives and fortunes of untold millions who look to us for the wise word and the right ac-

tion, wilt Thou lift us from the confusions and bafflements of these days into the unhurried calm of Thy presence? Grant us the peace which is the gift of Thy grace and the wisdom which is from above.

In the sacrifices now demanded for the continued boon of freedom may our eyes discern Thy judgments. In the worldwide strivings toward a brotherhood which knows nothing of color, creed, or race, may we see Thy kingdom's coming. In the clanking chains of the enslaved may our ears hear the voice of Thy command, "Let my people go." May the spiritual verities by which we really live assert their sovereignty and ascendancy over our hearts and minds as with unbroken vigil we keep the perpetual light of faith burning over the inner shrine of the soul. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day, Thursday, June 10, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2753) making supplemental appropriations to carry out the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2713) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. SHEPPARD, Mr. THOMAS of Texas, Mr. COFFEE, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. DITTER, Mr. PLUMLEY, and Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2080. A bill to provide temporary additional pay for equipment maintenance for each carrier in Rural Mail Delivery Service; and

H. R. 2536. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment," approved June 2, 1920, as amended, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the